Tabaqat Of Ansari In The Old Language Of Herat., 2030020037580. Ansari Tabaqat. 1923. English. SOCIAL SCIENCES. 383 pgs.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_220826

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

Tabaqat of Ansari in the Old Language of Herat

BY

W. IVANOW

[*From the* JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, *January and July, 1923.*]

JOURNAL OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
1923

PART I.—JANUARY

Tabaqat of Ansari in the Old Language of Herat

BY W. IVANOW

ALTHOUGH there are several works still extant which are ascribed, correctly or wrongly, to the authorship of the great Sufic saint of Herat, 'Abdu'l-lah Anṣārī (died A.H. 481/A.D. 1088),[1] his hagiological treatise, dealing with the early period of Sufism, was so far believed to have been lost. It was an enlarged Persian version of Abū 'Abdi'r-Raḥmān Muḥammad Sulamī's (d. A.H. 412/A.D. 1021) book *Ṭabaqātu's-Ṣūfiyyīn*,[2] which was composed in Arabic. All we knew so far about Anṣārī's work was derived almost exclusively[3] from Jami's description given by him in the preface to *Nafaḥātu'l-Uns*.[4] As it appears now, a copy of that version came to light as early as 1809,

[1] See about his full name and biography H. Ethé, *Grundriss d. Iran. Phil.*, v. ii, p. 282, and E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, v. ii, p. 270.

[2] See about him C. Brockelmann, *Gesch. d. Arab. Lit.*, v. i, pp. 200–1. His book is described in Ahlwardt's Catalogue, No. 9972 (v. ix, p. 408 sq.). There is another copy of the same work in the British Museum, Add. 18520.

[3] I have been unable to find any reference earlier than Jami's. All the posterior information by the authors who lived after him seems always to be derived directly or indirectly from the Nafaḥāt.

[4] Ed. Nassau-Lees, Calcutta, 1859, pp. 1–2.

when it was purchased for the library of the College of Fort William at Calcutta. It is at present preserved in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and bears the mark D 232 (or old 536).

A collation of its text with the corresponding portion of the Nafaḥāt[1] shows that both agree almost entirely in the matters discussed, and if not for various abbreviations and small changes in the order of biographies and, occasionally, separate sentences, Jami's version would be simply a modernized copy of Anṣārī's book. This may give me an excuse for leaving out of the scope of the present paper all the questions connected with the contents, as supposed to be already familiar to the students of Sufism. Being much pressed by want of space, I am compelled to confine this paper exclusively to an analysis of the linguistic side of the work. And before starting a discussion of this matter, I can give here only the most necessary preliminary information to introduce the material to the reader.

1. *Description of the Manuscript.*—The copy is in fairly good condition, only in a few places worm-eaten. It is quite neatly written in the ordinary Indian nasta'liq of the eleventh century A.H., on thick and smooth brownish paper, also obviously of Indian origin. The number of leaves of the text is 147, the size being 235 × 155 mm., 21 lines to a page occupying 180 × 90 mm. There is no usual opening Bismillah and it begins with:

الحمد لله حق حمده . . . قال الشيخ الامام الاجل السيد شيخ الاسلام . . . ابو اسمعيل عبد الله . . . الانصارى

There are 117 *chief* biographies, all with a heading of the same type (in red ink):

[1] Ibid., pp. 34-312. Some passages, obviously also belonging to the Ṭabaqāt, appear in the later part of the book, especially in the sections dealing with Ansārī and his contemporaries' biographies.

منهم من المتقدمين (or متوسطين, etc.) من الطبقة الاولى (or الثانية, etc.)

after which follows the name of the saint in question. At the end (fol. 139 verso) there is a فصل فى المعرفة والتوحيد. · The colophon (f. 147 v.) is very concise :

تم كتاب الطبقات من كلام پير هراة خواجه عبد الله انصارى قدس سره

Fortunately there is a note of collation, *muqābilah* (by a not very educated man) :

تم [*sic*] التحشية يوم الثبت [*sic !*] و المقابلة ليلة الاحد [*sic*] غرة رمضان المبارك ١٠١٥ من [*sic*] يد العبد افضل بن حميد احمد[1] قرسى[2] الپانى پتى [*sic*] على [*sic*] شط بهت[3]

Thus we can be quite certain that the copy was made in A.H. 1015/A.D. 1606, or shortly before that year, somewhere in India.

2. *Date and Authorship of the Book.*—The name of the author and the date of composition are not clearly stated in the text and they must therefore be reconstructed from the scattered allusions which shed some light on these points. Anṣārī was not the author of the book in the form in which it exists now. It was compiled by one of his

[1] قريشى ? Studying the colophons of MSS. prepared in India, one would think that persons of this noble descent were particularly fond of the scribe's profession—so common it seems to have been amongst them.

[2] Pānīpatī, indeed.

[3] Apparently the name of a river.

disciples (who conceals his name entirely), apparently from lecture notes made in the course of the shaykh's instruction addressed to an assembly of his *murīds*. They were apparently intended to correct and complete the text of Sulami's book, which was probably the immediate subject of Anṣārī's comment, although, strangely enough, this fact is not expressly mentioned in his work.

There is no doubt as to the author having been in direct communication with the shaykh from whom he learnt the sacred tradition (*ḥadīth*), and he probably had sufficient opportunity of private conversation with the saint.[1] Occasionally, however, it seems to be clear that the assembly of disciples was addressed.[2] And various expressions in some of these sentences indicate that the book received its final form *after* Anṣārī's death, probably within a short time after it.[3] Thus there is no doubt that the Ṭabaqāt were composed towards the end of the fifth century A.H. (or eleventh century A.D.).

3. *The language of the Ṭabaqāt.*—Even if the book had been written in the ordinary language of its time, it

[1] He mentions the shaykh as his immediate *rāwī* on ff. 46 v., 115 v., 124 v., 130, 147 v. Allusions to his conversations appear: (33 v.) (شیخ) کفت توحید دانی (86 v.) ; شیخ الاسلام کفت مرا چیست, etc.

[2] Cf. (2) شیخ بما وصیت کرد ; (4) شیخ برما املا کرد ; شیخ الاسلام وصیت کرد و کفت این سخن (99 v.) نویسید و یاد کیرید. See also f. 143 v.

[3] (114 v.) شیخ الاسلام بآخر عمر تن جند جدا کرد ازمشائخ الح

would present indubitable interest to the students of Persian, because specimens of prose composition dating from that period are quite rare. But, in fact, it affords some exceptional material, reproducing many local dialectical peculiarities. Jami did not hesitate to identify them as the "old dialect of Herat spoken in Anṣārī's days". An investigation of the question shows that this conjecture is quite correct, although Jami gives some details which seem to be rather misleading. As he says, the original text was so badly mutilated by the uninvited 'corrections' (*taḥrīf*) of ignorant copyists, that in his time it was quite incomprehensible to an average reader. This cannot be said of our copy, which contains but few obscure passages, although it must be at least 150 years younger than that used by Jami. It seems therefore as if there were two different versions, but a collation with the Nafaḥāt dispels all doubts as to their identity. In spite of abbreviations and a rearrangement of the text their chief bulk agrees word for word if we take into account Jami's modernization.[1] Therefore it may be concluded that our copy reproduces the original much better than even the versions found at Herat in the ninth century A.H.[2]

Jami's theory as to the association of the peculiar forms of Anṣārī's speech with the dialect of Herat is supported by the fact that they appear only in the quotations of the shaykh's own words. The language of his disciple (the

[1] Sometimes he preserves quite obsolete or provincial words in the Nafaḥāt, and a reference from Anṣārī's book invariably proves that they are exactly the same there and in a similar context. They will be mentioned in the vocabulary of rare words later on.

[2] Jami's words suggest that the Ṭabaqāt were quite popular. It seems strange therefore that copies of them are so rare. It is possible to conjecture that they all were abandoned when Jami's book received its great currency. Most probably therefore the original of our copy was brought to India before the Nafaḥāt came into existence, and was preserved better than other MSS. of the same work because the Indian scribes did not extend their activity to a 'correction' of the text as well as to its reproduction.

compiler of the book) is quite plain, although, no doubt, old-fashioned. All the biographies of the saint, as well as many passages in the Ṭabaqāt, agree in a statement that he was born in Quhandīz and spent there almost the whole of his long life. It would be highly improbable, therefore, to seek for an explanation of his strange idioms anywhere except in Herat.

Quite unexpectedly there is some other evidence in favour of this view. Very probably these deviations from the standard Persian were not confined to a small district of Herat with its immediate neighbourhood, but were common to the south-eastern corner of Khorasan in general. A unique manuscript of a Sufico-theological treatise, *Unsu't-Ṭāibīn* (E 20 or old 1000), is found in the same library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. It was composed probably at exactly the same period as the Ṭabaqāt by an inhabitant of Jām (a close dependency of Herat), also a Sufic shaykh (although of quite different dye), Abū Naṣr Aḥmad Nāmiqī, usually called Aḥmad-i-Jām (d. A.H. 536/ A.D. 1141).[1] The object in compiling his work was to prove his miraculous knowledge, inspired by some special divine act. There can be no doubt that he has done his best to couch it in as refined language as possible because his 'rusticisms' not only could easily betray the real absence of a proper education, but could even be simply ridiculed by his enemies. Yet his book is full of provincialisms, and they, both in phonology and syntax, perfectly agree with those of Anṣārī.

We will be committing a grave error if we think that this original dialect is adequately preserved in the Ṭabaqāt. Besides the usual efforts of the copyists, and even probably the author himself, to give Anṣārī's words and grammatical forms as 'correct' an orthography as possible, and thus to

[1] See about him and his books my article "A biography of Aḥmad-i-Jām" in *JRAS.* 1917, pp. 291–365.

destroy the original phonetic and other peculiarities, we can be almost certain that the shaykh himself did not use the dialect in its full integrity.

The conditions in Persia as they are nowadays show that the Persian language can be classed into three principal forms. The standard literary Persian is used only in the writings of well-educated people and in its pure form is never spoken. On the contrary, the dialects, spoken by the primitive nomads and villagers in remote corners of the country, are committed to writing only in exceptional occasions. All the transition forms from nearly pure standard Persian to almost unmixed dialect, used in speech as well as in writing, are usually called the 'colloquial' or, in lower forms, 'vulgar' language, which, naturally, approaches the literary fashions in the centres of civilization, large cities, and remains much akin to country-folk's chatting in small towns, off the main roads, where the population scarcely differs from that of a village.

Quite obviously there was a great difference between the language used by the highly learned, although somewhat conservatively inclined, Anṣārī and the speech of the primitive inhabitants of remote corners in the same province of Herat. And we will be quite right if we assume that it was merely one of the local dialectized forms of the *city-colloquial* which was used by the shaykh and his disciples and of which some peculiarities came down to us in the Ṭabaqāt.

I may conclude this brief introductory note with a few words on a very important point of methodology. If the language which we are going to analyse presently was the colloquial, there can be no doubt that it was still in the process of evolution. Therefore it is impossible to take all its deviations from the standard literary Persian as being uniformly 'archaisms' of it. The latter may have survived, but in a living speech we have more right to look for 'neologisms'. Unfortunately very little is known

about Persian as it really is, and not as it *must be* in the opinion of the scholastic traditional grammarians. So it is very difficult to deal with the phenomena observed in the evolution of the colloquial, but we must collect all as far as available, and take as a starting-point in our discussions not the 'crystallized' rules of the standard language, but the general principles which manifest themselves in the dialects or vulgar forms of speech and which can indicate the real direction in the process of development of the living Persian tongue.

4. *The nature of the peculiarities observed in the language of the Ṭabaqāt.*—The real reason why Jami calls the language of this book the "old idiom of Herat" can probably be explained as an attempt to attribute its uncommon peculiarities to a form of old speech no longer in use. In such case its definition as the language of Herat spoken in those days is quite logical because, as is known, Anṣārī, who was born in Herat, spent nearly the whole of his life in that city. So far there is no room for doubt that our version of the Ṭabaqāt and that used by Jami are identical, and it is quite possible that the same is the condition of the linguistic side. Although obviously modernized, the language of our book is still so rich in various archaic and uncommon forms that it cannot be regarded as a translation from an earlier text. Jami's own words do not allow us to think that the original version was couched in a dialect as different from the literary language as is the case with some idioms still spoken in Persia. A book written in them would be quite incomprehensible to an average reader. He says himself that the Ṭabaqāt were popular and that (in spite of a comparatively short period of only about three hundred years which had elapsed since Anṣārī's time) they were copied so often (obviously not only for the old-fashioned Heratis) that the text became badly corrupt on account of mistakes. It seems quite clear that these wretchedly ignorant scribes,

whose unskilled attempts to modernize the text spoiled it so greatly, were quite sure that only the partial modification of the forms (*taḥrīf* as Jami calls it)[1] was all that was required to make the language quite up to date. It is difficult to judge in how far his version was incorrect. Although he promises in his preface to omit these incomprehensible passages, he omits other portions of the text as well, apparently on different grounds.[2] A collation of our book and the Nafaḥāt suggests that the greatest part of what is not reproduced in the last-named treatise were numerous poetical quotations and the holy utterances *in Arabic*. Quite possibly, therefore, Jami omitted them not only because he regarded them as superfluous, but also because they might have been very deteriorated at the hands of the less educated scribes, as is usually the case with Arabic passages.

Thus Jami's statement, although probably not very far from being true, is again only his own logical deduction, and we are left to ourselves to find if it is correct or not. The only possible way to attempt this is to undertake a detailed linguistic analysis of the text. But we must come beforehand to a definite agreement as to the point of view from which these peculiarities should be criticized.

It is quite obvious that they cannot be treated only as archaic forms of literary Persian. The conjectures (like those of the late Prof. Baron V. Rosen)[3] about their being to a large extent the traces of some local dialects seem to

[1] To my knowledge this term is used rather rarely and probably may have been introduced with a desire to say that the changes alluded to were not in wording, but in letters (*ḥurf*), i.e. orthography of separate words.

[2] He usually shortens some very long stories and Anṣārī's own *à propos*, but occasionally the reason of omission is that Jami seems not to trust him entirely.

[3] Cf. E. Browne, *Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, 1896, p. 19.

be nearer to the truth. After a thousand years of the work of a levelling process,[1] in which a great part was taken by the influence of literary Persian as the language of religion, administration, commerce, and other forms of civilized life, and, on the other hand, after many foreign invasions, devastating wars, as well as peaceful migrations[2] and intercourse of the population of various provinces, we still see in Persia a great number of dialectical groups with their branches dissecting the country into numerous linguistically different districts. If such is the state of things nowadays, we can guess what a luxuriant

[1] It is difficult to believe that there were any important circumstances which could lead to the opposite state of things, i.e. integration in some dialectic groups. The Persian language is not very flexible and prefers to borrow a word rather than to create a new equivalent for it. As everywhere, the more educated individuals try to use a standard form of speech, and this promotes the gradual disappearance of local peculiarities in the vocabulary, filling it with the words of the 'bazar' Persian, which, in its turn, brings ready sentences, etc., and destroys in this way the grammatical peculiarities as well. All phases of this process can be watched in various local idioms of Persia. It is remarkable that while all these transition forms of the colloquial Persian meet no resistance on the part of the dialects and even quite different Iranian tongues, as Kurdish, Baluchi, and even Pashtoo, they find a very serious enemy in Turkish. Wherever a Persian- and a Turkish-speaking population lives close by, the former becomes first bilingual and then forgets its original tongue. Besides many provinces where this process is now completed as in Turkistan, Azarbayjan, etc., it can be seen still at work in many places of Persia proper, as along the Turkoman borders, in the Nishapur Valley, in Fars, and especially in the districts of Sultanabad and Hamadan, where often the villagers, who in their appearance, type of face, cranial index, etc., are pure Iranians, speak only Turkish.

[2] Such are periodical pilgrimages, performed by villagers to the various sacred places, usually combined with large bazars where the result of the harvest, etc., may be realized and the goods required by the peasants purchased. Moreover, there is an old and quite common type of migrations of whole villages, sometimes to very remote localities, in connexion with the exhaustion of the water supply needed for irrigation of the fields. The owners of newly constructed underground canals invite villagers, in similar circumstances, to change their places of habitation, and this is why one meets Isfahanis near Kermanshah or Anarakis near Sabzawar or Meshed.

variety of dialects the country possessed in those early days.[1]

The fact of the existence of a literary language which in the Muhammadan period made its appearance almost as completely as Athena from the head of Zeus, and remains practically unaltered till the present day, is very striking in such conditions.[2] Still more peculiar is the other fact

[1] Indications of the early differences in the local forms of speech are by no means rare in the Persian literature, although very scattered. Unfortunately the authors of *farhangs* mention the locality in which a particular word is used only on exceptional occasions, and all their endeavours are usually directed to accumulate these words to reconstruct the 'real old' Persian. Such is the case, e.g., with Asadi (*Lughati-Furs*, ed. P. Horn, 1897, preface, pp. 13–14), who rarely localizes his idioms, although many of them seem to be provincial. Even nowadays it is possible to trace some of them to a definite locality, as in the case of نغز (f. 24) 'good', پوشك (f. 38) 'cat', used in Bukhara; مسكه (f. 70 r.) 'butter', لوچ (f. 14 r.) 'squint-eyed', چابلوس (*chåpulusi* or *chapuluski*) (f. 27 r.) 'fraud', بك (f. 39 r.) 'frog', كربسه (f. 28 r.), now *kalpusä*, lizard, etc., are common to Khorasan, especially its southern part. Sometimes even neighbouring districts possessed their peculiar expressions, and an interesting instance from Anṣārī's time may be mentioned here. His younger contemporary, Aḥmad-i-Jām (died in A.H. 536), writes in his book انس التائبين (of which the apparently unique manuscript is preserved in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, E 20), on f. 122 v. :

عشقه (a sort of liana) كياهيست كه ما آنرا سن كوئيم ودر نيشاپور آنرا سريد كويند ودر جام اوقى كويند ودر روزن (?) آنرا اژغى كويند

[2] W. Geiger (*Grundriss d. Iranischen Philologie*, v. i, part ii, pp. 412–14) has no doubt as to this traditional language being the form cultivated at the courts of the Persian rulers. He believes that it was originally one of the local dialects of Fars, whence the greatest

of the existence of a more or less uniform *spoken* Persian, which was in use in the cities, from Baghdad to the remote corners of Soghd, being just as nowadays the language of the bazars all over the country. Therefore it seems quite possible to think that, as far as only the Persian-speaking population was concerned, even at those early days its language could be divided into three classes:

(1) Standard literary Persian, a purely artificial language, never *spoken* in its perfect form even by the most educated, who always more or less depend on some *local* form of speech. Besides the mode of spelling even in the almost pure literary form of language, there are always occasional provincial colloquialisms, involuntarily introduced, which make it possible to ascertain unmistakably from what part of Persia the speaker comes. In its really standard form it is only the *written* language of the artistic literary productions, such as 'good' poetry, bombastic ornate prose of all kinds, high-flown epistolary style, etc. A long study of the best specimens of the classic literature, Arabic, etc., is required to use this language correctly.

dynasties of Persia in the pre-Muhammadan period had come. The opinions of such a scholar as W. Geiger are too high authority to be criticized rashly. Therefore here I would like to allow myself to add a remark only because it is based on materials which were not available at the time when he wrote his invaluable book. The usual belief that standard Persian is spoken in its purest form in Fars is probably a product of the native imagination. In fact, not only in the villages the various dialects (quite incomprehensible to anyone who knows only standard Persian, as may be seen from the specimens collected by O. Mann in his *Die Tajik-Mundarten der Provinz Fars*, 1909) are very far from this condition, but even the colloquial form used in the cities by more educated people differs from the literary language by far more than in other parts of Persia. From my personal observations I believe that really the 'nearest' form to the standard language must be sought for in the other corner of Iran, especially in the provinces with the old Persian peasant population, i.e. the districts south from Herat, such as Gunābād, Jām, Qāīn, Birjand, Sunnīkhāna, Farāh, and probably Herat itself. It is quite remarkable that the oldest specimens of the Persian literature of the Muhammadan period all come from Khorasan, but Fars, where many books appear in Arabic, begins to contribute to the *Persian* literary treasure only in quite a late period.

(2) The dialects, as against the literary Persian. These are the mother-tongues of the uneducated peasantry and nomads. They are generally considered as absolutely incapable of being reduced to writing, and on the exceptional occasions in that simple life, when the necessity of writing a letter arises, a form (very corrupt indeed) of the literary Persian is used. Moreover, a striking fact may be observed in this connexion that even the most primitive individuals, who speak only their dialect, in their poetry (and even in such intimate forms of it as lullabies, etc.) try their best (usually in vain) to use as pure a form of the literary Persian as possible.[1]

(3) Colloquial Persian, the language of the educated classes and the bazars, very varied in its forms, from almost pure standard Persian to an almost unmixed local dialect. It appears as a medium in all the departments of the civilized life of the country, and also possesses a quite extensive literature. Apart from its purely accidental use in letters of the uneducated, etc., it appears instead of the intended standard Persian in the numerous literary productions, mostly by anonymous and less educated authors. There are numerous (usually small) pamphlets dealing with religious matters, orthodox as well as sectarian, religious legends about the Prophet and the holy martyrs, many versions of fairy tales, prescriptions of popular medicine, interpretations of dreams and omens,

[1] The attempts to write in a dialect seriously are very rare and only exceptional cases, such as of the Marzubān nāma, the Ḥurūfī literature, the poetry of Amīr Pazewārī, etc., can be recorded in the Caspian provinces (which in many respects are quite different from the remainder of Persia). In other parts of the country writing in a dialectical form of language is calculated exclusively as one of the means to produce a comical effect (just as it is common in all the languages to use for this purpose the rustic or foreign mode of spelling). But as the Oriental ideas about joking are somewhat peculiar, literature of this kind is invariably of extremely obscene character. Such is the poetry of Bū'ṣḥaq, Yaghmā, Fayyāḍ and Na'īr of Sabzawar, Mulla Ṣabūḥī of Birjand, etc.

magic prayers and incantations, etc.[1] The writings of this kind are almost invariably anonymous and, naturally, unique. They find a way into European libraries only rarely, and their unattractive appearance, extraordinary orthography, and the bad handwriting of men who take their 'qalam' only on exceptional occasions, secures for them the reputation of 'worthless' copies. This is, indeed, not a proper state of things. The 'vulgar' or popular literature, as it may be called, must be studied apart from the standard writings. There can be no doubt that it well deserves collecting and careful examination on account of the material it yields for the research into the history of the colloquial language, the popular forms of religious thought, folklore, etc., of the masses of population. A proper study of it may reveal much more indeed than the numerous diwans of the poets, which absorb always the chief attention of the librarians and which, it must be confessed, hardly deserve so much interest.[2]

It is quite noteworthy that even the earlier poetry contains so few of the various 'archaisms',[3] while we find them in a great number as soon as we turn towards what may be called 'scientific' or 'inartistic' prose, the books

[1] It is often surprising to find a very considerable number of local "men of letters" practically in every small Persian city. Very few, almost none of them, become known outside a very limited circle of their friends, and their books never survive them very long. Leaking roofs, playing children who tear the book to pieces, use of paper instead of glass in the windows in cold weather, etc., rarely spare these treatises for a very long time.

[2] It is extremely difficult indeed to draw a proper demarcation line between the 'standard' and the 'popular' literature because there are many transition forms. Only examination of every individual case can suggest to what class the book belongs.

[3] The great poem of Firdawsi occupies an isolated position. It seems quite possible that the unsuccessful presentation to Mahmud can be explained chiefly by the unpolished and even 'vulgar' language in which it was composed. Even nowadays for the greatest majority of the Persians it is not a *poem* but a versified *history*, couched in a very coarse and unskilled language which possesses 'no beauty'.

of tafsīr, lives of saints, medicine, etc. The explanation of this can only be that they were written in the more or less *colloquial* form of Persian. It seems quite probable that the authors, learned divines, who dedicated their entire scholarly zeal to the study of Arabic, which they often knew so thoroughly, cared little about the elegant high standard Persian in which, in their times, only panegyric poetry and, generally speaking, secular literature existed. Therefore, whenever they undertook, for various reasons, the composition of a book in Persian, they, quite naturally, were compelled to write in a somewhat 'vulgar' form of the language and, it may be, occasionally did so deliberately.[1]

The case of Anṣārī is apparently the same. The most important circumstance is that in the Ṭabaqāt its actual author uses quite 'polished' Persian. The dialectical 'flavour' appears in the language as soon as the shaykh himself begins to speak. The question why the author did not 'correct' these uncommon forms and give the style a more 'dignified' appearance may probably be explained in various ways. It may be due not only to the desire to preserve intact the words of the great preceptor, but also to an implicit admission that these forms, if left as they were, would not be offensive to anybody's taste as vulgarisms. The quotations from Anṣārī's own Munājāt seem to suggest that they were composed in a somewhat

[1] The question of the lawfulness of using Persian for compositions on religious matters, which was put to the Imams of Khorasan, as told in the preface to the Tafsīr of Ṭabarī translated into Persian in the fourth century A.H. (ff. 3-5 v. of the copy belonging to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Aa 19, which is about two hundred years older than that in the British Museum, but very defective), suggests that there was still a strong prejudice against the beginnings of the Persian secular literature. The reason for this was probably not its contents (because the same holy divines admired very much the old Arabic poetry which was by no means very religious), but possibly the fact that the memory of its connexion with the pagan tradition was still too fresh.

similar form of language,[1] and it is quite likely that the shaykh used it for writing as well. From what we know about his character, which was simple and straightforward, averse from all sorts of conventionalities, it seems quite possible that he made use of this language deliberately. There is another case in the history of Persian literature which very closely resembles that of Anṣārī. About five centuries later there was another shaykh who could with equal right claim the title of the "champion of the true tradition and the defender against heresy", the founder of Afghan literature, Akhūnd Darwīza Ningrahārī.[2] His books are little known in Europe, but they well deserve careful study, if for no other reason than that their author possessed a deeply original and characteristic individuality (a case so rare in Eastern life) which induced him to reject the prejudices against writing in Pashtoo. As this Peshawari saint found it possible to use this 'rustic and unliterary' language of the savage Afghan tribes for his spiritual instructions at the time when Persian

[1] The manuscripts of his Munājāt are extremely numerous, but, at the same time, they differ much one from the other and every copy seems to be individual. I never saw any manuscript of this book older than 300 years and the language appears to be invariably quite modern. Perhaps the Ṭabaqāt will help to recover the original version and to reconstruct its language. An interesting question arises in connexion with these pious invocations. Versified 'prayers' almost of the same type are quite common (in the poems of 'Aṭṭār they occupy hundreds of pages), but in prose, as far as I know, they were not composed by anybody except Anṣārī. A striking likeness exists between them and the Manichean Maḥrnāmag, in Pehlevi, published by F. W. K. Müller ("Ein Doppelblatt aus einem Manichäischen Hymnenbuch", *Abhandl. d. k. Preussischen Ak. d. Wiss.*, 1912). There is so little originality in the forms of Persian literature that a suspicion arises as to the possible connexion which might exist between both. Is it a simply accidental resemblance or a case of literary atavism, or direct and intentional imitation of a similar form in the old literature?

[2] He flourished in the early part of Akbar's reign. About his biography and works see the pamphlet of Dr. Leyden in the *Asiatic Researches*, v. x, pp. 363–428, also in C. Rieu's *Persian Catalogue*, p. 28, and that of H. Ethé (of the library of the India Office), Nos. 2632–8. Almost all his treatises have been lithographed at Peshawar and Lahore.

literature had already reached the culminating point in its development, and when on the plains of India the 'great' poets like Fayḍī were busy with their 'jewels' of Indo-Persian poetry, still easier was it for a sound-minded and sincere divine such as Anṣārī to try to write in the same way as he was accustomed to speak.

All that has been said above will, I hope, justify an admission that the peculiarities of the language of the Ṭabaqāt belong entirely to the *colloquial* form of Persian as spoken at Herat (and possibly all over South-Eastern Khorasan) in the middle of the fifth century A.H., i.e. a little later than the time of the great Firdawsi. No doubt, even if a modernizing of the text is taken into account, it was not a vulgar form of the colloquial, but probably what may be styled as the speech of the 'better classes of society'.

If so, we have no right to confine the analysis of these uncommon forms to a collation with the literary language. If we want to trace their real nature we are obliged to compare them also with analogous formations in the colloquial and the dialects by which they might be influenced. Although very little has been done so far for the elucidation of the history of the Persian dialects or even for an inquiry into their present state, it is necessary to make use even of this small opportunity which is offered by the scarce materials now available. From this point of view many archaisms would rather deserve the title of 'modernisms', i.e. early forms of the same processes which are still at work in Persian speech. And the existence of similar cases renders still more evident the antiquity of other really archaic linguistic usages which have disappeared since Anṣārī's time, in spite of the unique slowness in the progress of the development and 'exchange' shown by both the literary as well as the colloquial Persian.

5. *Detailed Analysis of the Peculiarities of the Language*

A. *Notes on Phonology*

As compared to the rich material offered by the peculiarities of its morphology, vocabulary, etc., the present copy preserves very few traces of the original phonetic divergencies from the standard Persian. This may be attributed partly to the efforts of the 'educated' actual author of the Ṭabaqāt, and, perhaps in a still greater degree, to the activity of the more modern copyists who tried to bring the book more up to date.

(1) *Vowels.* (*a*) Some indications suggest that the process, so prominent in the colloquial and the dialects of to-day, viz. the variation of what is usually known as the prosodic value of the vowels, was at work even at that time.[1] The examples given here may be, however, simply mistakes in writing, but we have a certain claim to attribute to them a higher value, because 'mistakes' of the same nature are prominent in the manuscripts written in Khorasan, old as well as new. Such are صباهانی and اصفاهانی (34 v., 130, 136, 137 v., etc.), while اصفهان, etc., are as usual; آزرد for آزارد (134 v.); جورب for جراب (129 v.); خشی for خوشی (39 v.); سی for سه (89 v.),[2] etc.,

[1] The questions of the real position of these prosodic theories and the traditional orthography based on them require a careful revision as soon as they are intended to be applied to colloquial and dialectical Persian. The variations of this kind are some of the most common phonetic rules in all the living Iranian tongues; cf. W. Geiger, "Die Centr. Dialect." (*Grundr. d. I. Ph.*, v. i, part ii), p. 384, and D. Lorimer's addenda ("Notes on the Gabri Dialect," *JRAS.* 1916), pp. 428–30. The same is very common all over Khorasan and in Fars (see O. Mann, *Die Tajik Mundarten*, 1909, p. 8), and even in Kurdish and Pashtoo; cf. W. Geiger (ibid.), *Die Sprache d. Afghanen*, p. 208, and A. Socin (ibid.), *D. Sprache d. Kurden*, pp. 265–6.

[2] Common in Khorasan. *si* or *su*.

as well as often ـم instead of ـیم in the 1st person plural of verbs, as in ما این علم درسر دابها برکرفتیم ودادم (80 v.), و خانها کفتم (45),[1] etc. Perhaps of the same nature are the numerous cases of confusion of به and نه with با and نا.[2] All these changes can be easily explained from the physiological structure of the Persian sounds, and the examples given here suggest that some 900 years ago these phonetic principles were apparently the same.

(*b*) Obviously the same process governs the use of the prosthetic vowel. There are many examples which although uncommon in standard Persian, are often heard in the colloquial. Such are اشکسته (33), اشنوده (58, etc.), اطربلس (64), صفاهانی (34 v., etc.).[3]

(2) *Liquida.* All that can be observed in connexion with this group is the ease with which they undergo transposition: کنار appears here almost invariably as کران (66 v., 80, etc.), and even کرانه for کناره. The usual اصطخری becomes اصطرخی (106 v.), etc.[4]

(3) *Dentals.* Probably for purely orthographic reasons

[1] In Khorasan both the 1st person sing. and plur. are spelt as *-um*, and this explains why mistakes as above are very common in the MSS. copied there.

[2] For examples see the section on the negative particles and indeclinabilia.

[3] The colloquial seems to be fond of changing these forms without any apparent reason, and *ishkas(t)*, *istân*, *ishtew* (شتاب), *ushtur*, *ustâra*, etc., are heard as frequently as *shikast*, etc.

[4] These changes are also common in the vulgar language.

the dental spirant ذ disappeared entirely. Even in quite common words as ایذر ، کذشتن ، پذیرفتن, etc., the diacritical dot is often missing. Only in a few cases does ذ appear in a position which suggests an obvious mistake, such as دیذانقان (33, for دندانقان) and بنیوشیذ (23). It seems quite likely, however, that in the original copy the ذ was freely used, because in several instances where the scribe might take it for ز he preserved it intact, as in بازانك (for بادانك ?) and نازان (for نادان?), both apparently from دانستن.[1] The dental of the old *paδ* appears here quite commonly, as د and forms like بدو، بدین ، بدان are very frequent. The traces of *sandhi* of dentals are also common in بتر for بدتر ، دوستر for شکفتر ، دوست تر, etc. Various examples can suggest that in Anṣārī's time the final د in the *-and* of the 3rd person plural of the verbs was omitted as frequently in the colloquial as nowadays (ببریدن for ببریدند, etc.).

[1] It is extremely difficult to form an opinion, based on a study of the old MSS., as to whether there was any difference in pronunciation in the cases of dotted and undotted *dāl*. Very few MSS. of those which I had a chance to examine followed this system quite thoroughly. Much more common are the cases in which copies of the same age and probably coming from the same province observe this rule with greatest carelessness. In an old Tafsīr (No. Aa 7 of the Asiatic Society of Bengal),

(4) *Labials.* The process, common to all the Iranian languages from Kurdish in the extreme west to Soghdian in the remote corner of the east,[1] i.e. the gradual 'melting' of all sounds of this group into an indifferent interlabial spirant *w*, is well represented here.[2] The examples are very numerous: (*a*) In the beginning of a syllable: ور for بر (common), وا for با (54 v., 55, etc., often); وایست، واید, etc. The same in the middle of words, ستوروان، بالیزوان، میزوان, etc.[3] (*b*) Intervocal: یاویدن (common, although never یاوت for

the copy of which was apparently made by a professional high-class scribe (as his surname سیّد الخطاط shows) in the beginning of the seventh century A.H. in Khorasan, very often such words as خذاوند، براذر can be found, while on the contrary almost invariably there are بدیرفتن، کدشتن, etc.

[1] As, e.g., in *ṭampār* (82, 1), *ṭambār* (81, 10), and *ṭamfār* (3, 4), or *chīmīt* and *chīwīt* (common), etc.; see F. W. K. Müller, "Soghdische Texte," i, *Abhandl. d. k. Preussischen Ak. d. Wiss.*, 1912.

[2] This process can be traced as continually developing since the earliest period of the history of the Iranian languages. In the Avesta it gains ground from the pre-Iranian (cf. C. Bartholomae, "Awestasprache," in *G. d. I. Ph.*, i, pt. i, pp. 163, 165) and further in Pehlevi (cf. C. Salemann, "Mittelpersisch," ibid., p. 259). In modern Persian it is prominent even in the standard language (cf. P. Horn, "Neupersische Schriftsprache," ibid., pt. ii, p. 48). About this process in the dialects see W. Geiger, ibid., p. 298 (Pamir group), p. 351 (Caspian gr.), p. 386 (Central gr., also D. Lorimer, op. cit., pp. 434–5), O. Mann, op. cit., pp. 12–13 (dialects of Fars), and A. Socin, op. cit., pp. 261, 263 (in Kurdish).

[3] This is as common in the colloquial of to-day as in old MSS. Cf. 'Attār's Tadhkira, ed. R. Nicholson, v. ii, introduction, p. 6.

یافت. The forms یابی ، یابم, however, are also used),[1] خاویدن (*sic*, 73, apparently for خواویدن, i.e. خوابیدن), تاوستن ، پای‌تاوه, etc. The original intervocal و must probably have disappeared entirely, as in شیدن (103 v.) for شویدن.

(*c*) At the end of a syllable: اوکندن (78, 129 v., etc.), کوران (68) for کبران, etc.

It seems, however, that for some uncertain reasons, or perhaps as a local or archaic peculiarity, this decayed labial assumed a form not of an interlabial, but of labio-dental spirant *v*, which was often reproduced as ف. The examples of this are by no means scarce: کوش فازان (107), فا(با)تو سخن کوید (128), (وازان) بود و دیده فازان (123, for واپس), etc. Moreover, there are some

[1] This example (as well as further *awgandan*) resembles Pehlevi forms *yāvēṭan*, *avgandan*. These old-fashioned forms are not the only ones given here (on f. 143 دوژخ appears for دوزخ, etc.). But it is rather difficult to believe that *yāvēṭan* became first *yābīdan* and then came to its previous form. We are compelled to think that either there is some confusion about the early phonetical equivalents of ف ، پ ، ب and و or that there were (as alluded to later on) two distinct currents of the same process in the development of labials, one of which preferred the labio-dental group while the other transformed all sounds of this class into the interlabial *w*.

instances of the preservation of the original tenuis, as in سپید (common), سپند دانه (145 v.), etc.[1]

(5) *Enclitica.* The present copy shows a quite unusual development of the joined writing of the enclitica. Although this is very common in MSS. from Khorasan (probably a reflection of the local mode of pronunciation), here it reaches rare limits. There are usually جکنی ، کو ، ازو ، جززیشان ، جززو ، جزز ، جزو (73 v., etc.) ، جکویم (75 v., etc.),[2] همو ، جنو (چون‌او), etc. اکر and واکر usually appear as in poetry in the forms of ار and ور. I did not notice چه written as ج in the combinations with آن, etc., but there are several cases of بانك (130, 140, etc.) for به‌آن که.

[1] This depends probably on the physiological influence of the spirant *s*, which facilitates a tenuis after itself. Although in the Eastern (Khorasani) Kurdish dialect it often appears as *siwī*, the Persians and especially Herati Parsiwans spell it *ispīd*, *ispand*, etc.

[2] While this way of writing چه is common in the present copy, I did not notice the same with reference to که, although the latter is very common in the old MSS. Cf. E. Browne, "Description of an old Persian Tafsīr," *JRAS.* 1894, p. 433; also R. Nicholson, op. cit., v. ii, introd., p. 7, etc. In the old copy of the translation of Tafsīr-i-Ṭabarī (mentioned above, No. Aa 19 in the library of A.S.B.) که is written together with the following word nearly always, while چه very rarely.

B. *Noun*

(1) *Notes on derivation. I. Suffixes.* (*a*) *-ak*, suffix of the diminutives, is used here as freely as in the colloquial, e.g. كارك ، بازارك ، شمارك ، سرك, etc., even with a compound word (132) جايكى كردند جها رطاقك.[1] Very interesting is a case of the use of *-akak* in (41 v.) ريز ككى لنكى درمى بايست, etc.[2] P. Horn (op. cit., p. 175) calls it, in a similar example, a double diminutive suffix. This may be so, but the cases of *mardäkä*, *zanäkä*, etc. (of which a non-apocopated form is supposed to be *mardäkäk* and *zanäkäk*), do not convey much of diminutive sense. Would it not be better to explain the second *-äk* as analogous to the similar suffix in Kurdish, a sort of indefinite article (which is here emphasized by *i*)?[3]

(*b*) *-agi* forms here not only the usual abstract nouns (cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 180), but, as often in the colloquial,

[1] The frequency of its use may be attributed perhaps to Anṣārī's individual taste as well. I cannot remember to have ever heard in the colloquial similar cases as above (diminutive of بازار is usually بازارجه and سرك is used only in *säräk käshidän* in the sense of 'to spy, to watch stealingly' in Fars). As far as I could notice, this suffix nowadays is never applied to abstract names in the colloquial, and although it is very commonly used (frequently in its shortened form *-ä*, cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 174), the suffix *-chä* is preferred with names of inanimate objects.

[2] Jami (Nafaḥāt, p. 82) reproduces the sentence literally, showing that in his opinion the form was not obsolete.

[3] I often heard this suffix in its full form in the remote corners of the Southern Khorasan, such as the villages *Riqāt*, *Kubegū*, *Rich*, etc. (district of *Khūsp*), especially in fairy tales: *mardäkäki bud* . . . or *ruzäkäki*, etc.

the adjectives. Such are ترسایکی (4, adjective), خَیْرکی (145 v.), اصطخرکی (118, for اصطخری), etc.

(*c*) *-cha*, usually diminutive (cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 177), is used here often with the proper names, as in امیرجه (134 v.), خیرجه (131 v., for ابو الخیرجه ?), سفال فروش لیث بوشنجه (131 v., for بوشنج جه ?), etc.

(*d*) *-ū* (if it is not simply a mistake of the copyist) appears here only once (102) ای پسرو, in the sense of a diminutive (or vocative ?) suffix.[1]

(*e*) ویه —. As a contribution to the question of this suffix the following passage may be quoted (107 v.): از صورت نیکو وخوش خواندن وی ویرا کنیه بنازویه کردند.[2]

(*f*) کان — as a distributive suffix appears here in a quite

[1] Cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 184. At present it seems to be more common in the eastern half of Persia and apparently can be traced to three different forms: (1) in the cases of its use with the vocative probably as a local variation of the vocative *-ā* used in standard Persian (in Isfahan *-ī* is in use), especially common with the names of women, e.g., *Gawharú*, *Sultánú*, etc.; (2) as an apocopated form of the diminutive suffix *-ak*, e.g., *khurdú*, *kuchulú*, etc.; (3) may be the remnant of the old suffix *-ū* (the same as in *bānū*, etc.).

[2] This suffix, even if it is of purely Persian origin, is absolutely forgotten now, and, as an interesting example, it may be mentioned that the word شیرویه (the name of the hero of a popular fairy tale) is invariably spelt *Shirwiyä*.

colloquial use in (117) تو مرا خودرا یکان بیامرز (cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 116. At present it is used only in Bukhara in similar sense, in Persia *yakkä* is preferred).

(*g*) *-i*, in its adjectival sense, is used several times with a compound of which the last member is a pronoun (80 v.): الحمد لله که ازصلب من جنوئی بود کوترا شایست (here جنوئی obviously for چون اوئی).[1] Also (53 v.) جون توئی عقل مخلوقست برهمچوخودی (107) ;را سخن باید دلالت کند.[2]

(*h*) *-īn* and *-īna* are used quite freely: (51) مهینه، میانین بسینه, etc. (cf. P. Horn, op. cit., pp. 180–1). Somewhat uncommon is (43) سرتابای پرزرینه.

(*i*) A case of somewhat peculiar use of the suffix وار— (78 v.), where it can be translated by 'as if': ووی در عرق غرق وارند (apparently for غروارید, see later, C, 6), "and he is *as if* drowning in sweat" (cf. Horn, op. cit., p. 191).

(*j*) The old suffix *-āwand* (cf. C. Salemann, "Mittel-

[1] Jami (Naf., 161) reproduces the sentence intact, perhaps because this form did not seem to him obsolete.

[2] Cf. Nafaḥāt, 243; the difference is only that همچون is used instead of همچو.

persisch," *G.I.Ph.*, I, i, 280, and P. Horn, op. cit., p. 187) appears here only in the word خویشاوند (128).[1]

(*k*) Probably a purely dialectic suffix *-ast* forming onomatopœia appears in طرکست (121) — شبی آواز — طرکست آمد — in the sense of 'crackling'.[2] So far as I could find, formations of similar type are common at present only in the Southern Khorasan (districts of Birjand, Qain, Sunni-khana), as *täräkast* (as above), *shälåpast* "the sound of slapping", *ghurrast* "the sound of rapidly burning fire" (=*ghur-ghur*), etc. I cannot remember having seen it in the literary language.[3]

(*l*) A strange suffix (?) *-āmār* appears in two words تشنامار (84) for تشنگی (as in Nafaḥāt, 156) and گشنامار (96 v., 123, 124) for گرسنگی (Nafaḥāt, 305, etc.),

[1] This particular word, as well as generally the suffix *-āwand*, is quite forgotten (*khishú* خویشان or *qo'me khish* قوم خویش is used instead). Perhaps it will be not quite useless to recall that the suffix for the names of the various step-relatives, —اندر, mentioned by E. Browne in his description of the old Tafsīr (*JRAS.* 1894, p. 487), is still common in Southern Khorasan in *mårändar*, *khårändar* (مادراندر، خواهر اندر), etc.

[2] Jami reproduces this word as if it were quite all right (Nafaḥāt, 281).

[3] Sometimes these formations are used in the same way of repetition, just as the monosyllabic onomatopœia: *shälåpast-shälåpast*, *ghur-ghurrast*, etc.

the last apparently from گشنه, *gushnä* (133 v.), still used all over Persia but considered rather vulgar.[1]

(*m*) The suffixes of the verbal nouns will be treated in the section dealing with verbs.

II. Composition. Nothing special can be noted in connexion with compound nouns. An extremely rare case of the use of a purely verbal form in the sense of a substantive can be registered (98 v.) در بند تو متوانی کشته "became powerless in thy ties" (in the Nafaḥāt this passage is omitted). This متوان is undoubtedly the negative form of the imperative and I can remember only one other case, i.e. مدان میهنکی in *Asrāru't-tawḥīd fī maqāmāt Shaykh Abī-Sa'īd.*[2] Compounds such as هیچمدان are very common, but cases where only the verb with this prohibitive particle is used as a substantive can be regarded as real archaisms.

(2) *Flexion.* (*a*) The suffixes of plural ان— and ها— are used indifferently, as in the contemporary colloquial, and the latter is the more common.[3] No single case of

[1] Perhaps this has something to do with *mār*, 'snake,' to which the pains of hunger or thirst may be attributed? In such case the first *-ā-* may be similar to that often used in the copulative compounds, cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 196, as in *sarāsar*, *barābar*, etc. I remember once having *heard* the word *gushnåmår* in Khorasan, but did not pay attention to it because I regarded it as an invention of the man who was talking.

[2] Ed. by V. Zhukovski, 1899. Unfortunately I cannot cite the page because I have not this book at hand.

[3] The usual theory, based on the native grammars, that ان— is to be added to the names of the animate beings and ها— to those of the inanimate ones, is rarely correct, in any case as far as the colloquial is concerned. One hears invariably *mardå*, *zanå*, *aspå*, *dukhtarå*, etc.

ات— with a Persian word was noted. The form كان (cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 105) after a consonant is rare; only one case registered here (139 v.) آزادكان. Another irregular form is (29) خاصكيان (for خواص ?), but it may be explained as derived from the somewhat vulgar خاصگی. Occasionally with nouns, but more commonly with the pronouns, the suffix of the plural does not appear at all, and the verb does not agree in number with its subject, as in (87 v.) كوينده جيزى برخواندند or (59 v.) اوكه نه اهل او بودند, etc.

(*b*) Nothing special can be noted about the *Iḍāfa* except that in several cases it is expressed in the text by ى: (115 v.) درکارى کودك مبتلا شد or (71) بسرى وى, etc.

(*c*) The oblique case is rarely formed here with را— مر or مر[1] alone (it might disappear as a result of the activity of the later scribes). Only a few examples can be collected: كفت فرايكى كه مر اين كار بكن (90), مر وى (75 v.), ابن اعرابى را كتبست مر اين طائفه را (108).

(*å* = ها, because the *h* is imperceptible in the pronunciation). On the contrary, *dastú*, *churåghú*, *båzårú*, etc., are freely used (*ú* = *-ān*).

[1] Needless to say that in the colloquial and the dialects this form is absolutely extinct.

(*d*) On the contrary, there are very frequent cases of omission of را where it might be expected, especially with the accusative,[1] as in (60) جنید دیده بود, (116) تو بتو بخشیدم, (62 v.) او(را) بیند, (117 v.) شاشك خر بکزید, (115) عمو حصری ندیده بود, etc. The same with the dative: (27) وقوم سدیکر می نه دوست تو بود که تو با او مدارا باید, (72) بنداری که کاراند علم آنست که تو او می باید جست, (96) کرد, etc.[2]

(*e*) Uncommon use of را: (1) with the nominative: راه فرا الله شناختن آسانست یافت را عزیز است (28 v.), وی را باره‌ء کاغذ می بکار داشت (32 v.),[3] etc.; (2) with a preposition: (80, 127 v.) از بهر خدای را, (121 v.) بهر الله را,

[1] It is a well-known fact that in the colloquial very often a special suffix *a*, *ä*, *e*, *u* is used for the accusative: *aspa biår*, etc. The particle را (which becomes *rå*, *rä*, *ri* in various districts) is frequently omitted even if there is stress on the accusative and if it is quite definite, as in *ī bedey* 'give (me) this', etc.

[2] In Khorasan the construction with *bär*, *wär* (بر) is invariably preferred for the dative and only in one case it is similar to that used by Anṣārī, i.e. in the case of *män*, as frequently: *bedey män*, *bugu män*, etc. The possessive still preserves *rå*, but the direct construction with *dåshtän* is more common.

[3] Cf. Horn, op. cit., 110, and R. Nicholson, *Tadhkira*, introduction. 9. The verb *dåshtän* not rarely receives this intransitive sense (as in Samnani, cf. Geiger, op. cit., 367). There are similar expressions in the colloquial, as *injå chi dåräd* 'what is here'.

(122 v.) آدم زهرست بتوحیدرا, etc.; (3) in the sense of a locative (or simply a strange use of the possessive ?): (78) دوازده راه بشناسم بادیه‌را.

(*f*) Several cases of the indefinite locative, as in the colloquial, can be noted, where the preposition is omitted, as in (116) خانه بود, etc.[1]

(3) *The comparative degree.* The suffix of the comparative degree *-tar* is occasionally added here to substantives with a preposition (which suggests that these groups are regarded as adjectival compounds): (119 v.) بی کس تر, (119 v.) بی‌جاه‌تر, (116 v.) باآلت‌تر, etc. In several cases it is added to the present participles کُشنده‌تر، سوزنده‌تر, etc. Sometimes it is combined with the diminutive suffix *-ak* as in (129 v.) سخترك, etc.[2] The old به، که، مه[3] are used without *-tar* in the comparative degree, but in the positive they accept the suffix *-īn*, مهین، کهین, etc. (Only few cases of مهتر, used as substantive (126 v.) can be noted.) Probably local are cases of the use of جون instead of از as in (27) قادرتر ندیدم جون (فلان).

[1] In the present colloquial the preposition is usually omitted when motion *towards* something is expressed: *murum shār* (میروم بشهر), *burow khåna* (برو بخانه), etc.

[2] The colloquial uses this form frequently, but the final *-k* is not pronounced, as in *bishtärä*, *durtärä*, etc.

[3] Not used nowadays without the suffix *tar*.

(4) *Numerals.* The word *first* is invariably rendered with اول (نخست does not appear at all), but *second* and *third*, except in a few cases, have an old form سدیکر and دیکر.[1]

(5) *Pronouns.* (*a*) Personal pronouns are often used here instead of the demonstrative, accompanied by the relative, e.g. (24 v.) اوست که, (57, etc., common) ایشان که, (71) واو عادت بود اورا که جنین کفتی, etc. Sometimes او stands for plural: (59 v.) او که نه اهل اوبودند, (145) اویند که میشناسند, etc. The peculiarities of the oblique case of the personal pronouns are mentioned above (para. 2 of this section). One case of ورا (18 v.) is probably a mistake for ویرا.

(*b*) The demonstrative pronouns آن and این are often used in the plural, with the suffix ان.

(*c*) The interrogative and relative pronouns که and چه *never* appear in this copy in the plural and only rarely receive را (usually چه, but there are cases in which کرا is found as well: (131) هر کرا سیم باید, (132) کرا یاد اید, (135 v.) کرا دوستر داری, etc.). A striking

[1] Still in common use amongst the Heratis and in the south-eastern part of Khorasan.

example of the relative که used with a preposition (this cannot be a mistake) is found on f. 92 v. تو (چون) بودی آنجا ورکه من بیش تو میرفتم.[1]

(*d*) The reflexive pronoun is as usual, only in a few cases it seems to appear pleonastically, as in (70 v.) وخود هیچکس جون اونکوید, etc., or in a somewhat peculiar way, still quite common in the colloquial: (4 v.) ارنه خود سه بودند "if not, they would be four altogether" (he himself and three others).[2]

(6) *Pronominal suffixes.* They are used very freely in all possible combinations, with the prepositions and conjunctions and even independently. (*a*) Somewhat uncommon combinations: تاش، بم، کش، کت، کم, etc., as in (78 v.) کم برو (i.e. که مرا برای او), (67 v.) حجاب دارد تاش نشناسند (29 v.), کسیرا کش نخواهی, etc. Occasionally they are combined even with the enclitic form of the verb substantive, as in (96 v.) دیکر علم آنست که نه محیط شند بقدر دوست که کم شند دروست.

[1] This passage is not reproduced literally in the Nafaḥāt, where another expression is used.

[2] This use of the reflexive pronoun, as far as I know, has only some analogy in Russian. In the colloquial of to-day in Khorasan, and especially amongst the Parsiwans of Afghanistan, *khūd* is often simply an equivalent of *bā* 'with'. *Khude qåfilä umad* does not mean 'the caravan itself arrived' but 'he arrived with the caravan'; *khude ú* is frequently not 'he himself' but 'with him', etc. The further development of the same is *khot*, as in *khot mu* 'with us' (Sabzawari).

(*b*) Used independently.[1] (40) ورشناسم ام ویران کنی خداوندا اول مان (86 v.) . . . ور باز کردم ام بیقرار کن بیافریدی, etc.

(*c*) In the sense of the nominative (=او), as in (103 v.) کفت ارباى دارید بخراسان شید بزیارت کسی کش دوستست (=که او مارا).[2]

(*d*) As interjection with the demonstrative pronoun (119 v.) اینت شیخ و اینت معاملت.

[1] Although there are in the present colloquial forms, as *ish yuf*, etc., they probably can be explained as syncopated demonstr. pr. *i* (*in*) with pleonastically used *-ash*, personal suffix of the 3rd person singular.

[2] Nafaḥāt, 209 بزیارت کسیکه مارا دوست است . . .

(*To be continued.*)

JOURNAL OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
1923

PART III.—JULY

Tabaqat of Ansari in the Old Language of Herāt

BY W. IVANOW

(*Continued from p. 34.*)

C. *Verb*

1. *Stems.* Besides a few uncommon spellings (as تاوستن ، او کندن ، یاویدن, etc., see above, A, 4) nothing particular can be observed with regard to the formation of both verbal stems, present and past.[1] The latter in a few cases appears to be formed from the former in a so-called 'regular' way, and to be used instead of the original preterite, as in (18) نازیدم ، بردازیدم ، سازیدم, (92 v.) افتیدم,[2] etc. The verbal compounds also do not show many peculiarities,

[1] There is a form which seems to be different from the literary, viz. انکشت, probably for انگیخت, (38 v.) درجه، ویرا محسوب نکرد و بنه انکشت.

[2] Although this form seems to be quite Pehlevi-like (cf. C. Salemann, op. cit., 303), it is very common in Khorasan (*äftídum*).

and only a few more or less archaic prepositions, as فراز ، فرا, etc., deserve to be mentioned.

2. *Nominal formations.* I. *Infinitive.* (*a*) The regular infinitive, with suffixes *-tan* and *-dan*, is more common here than in the literary language or the colloquial, where nowadays it is used very rarely.[1] Apparently the verbal sense of this form was well felt in the time of Anṣārī because the modal particle *bi* is frequently added to it, but, on the other hand, the infinitive appears only in nominal constructions, and, while often found in the *status constructus, iḍāfa,* rarely governs the definite accusative. The examples are very numerous: (1) The infinitive as a subject: (18) یاد کردن کسبست و فراموش نکردن زندکانی, etc. (cf. C. Salemann, op. cit., 308). (2) The infinitive in the same sense with *bi*: (21 v.) (آن) ازدنیا دست, (38) خدمت بنه کردن سود نکند بداشتن است, (67) بنه اندیشیدن جنایت است, etc. (3) With *iḍāfa:* (6 v.) آن بکذاشتن نصهای کتاب است (21 v.) سبب دست (32), سبب جشم بشدن تو جه بود ازکار بداشتن او آن بود که, etc.

(*b*) The so-called 'apocopated' infinitive is still more common here. Not only is it used with various

[1] In the peasant language in many districts of Khorasan this form seems to be practically never used, and the direct verbal construction is invariably preferred. Instead of بعد از رفتن او the people will say: *ú ki raf* (with this 'post-positional' *ki*), etc. It seems that even good colloquial avoids it.

auxiliary verbs,[1] but apparently even at that time seems to have been more popular than the regular form. Examples are available in great number, but a few will suffice: (16) کارك خود روز و شب می اندازم واز بیم از یافت (43), یاد کردرا (17 v.), تو اندر بود می کذارم همه نیکویها نیکو (70 v.), حق نیستیء خود نشان دهد (95 v.), شود بیود او وبنه بود همه زشتها زشت شود بودِ آن حیاتست (145 v.), کذاردِ طاعت, etc.[2]

(*c*) Another verbal noun, although not as common, seems to be simply the present stem. The examples are rather rare and I arrange them into a special class, only judging from the analogous usages in the present colloquial[3]: (18) بتوان تو ترا می جوید, (55) سه جیزست

[1] As we will see later, however, there are instances (common in the old language) in which the full form of infinitive is used in such cases.

[2] There is no doubt that in the colloquial this 'apocopated' infinitive is the only one used. Many special suffixes are mentioned as being in use in the dialects (as in the Central group, cf. W. Geiger, op. cit., 399-400, and D. Lorimer, 466), but it is necessary to be extremely cautious in treating them as such. The idea of an infinitive is too abstract for the practical and unsophisticated peasants, and therefore they easily add the personal pronominal suffixes, etc., to make it more concrete. The suffix *-mun*, perhaps, is مان — of the 1st pers. plur., and *kertmun* means '*our* doing', etc., but in the case of *-un* or *-iun* it is necessary to note that they (apparently originally the suffixes of the plural) occasionally form a sort of abstract name: *arusún*, i.e. عروسی 'wedding', *churåghún* (چراغان) 'evening' (i.e. period from the beginning of darkness and till the peasants go to bed, 6-7 p.m. to 8-9 p.m., when lamps are used—*åkhiri churåghú umad* 'he came late in the evening').

[3] The examples of this use of the present stem are very numerous in the colloquial: *furush, bedeh* (*hich bedéyi nedårúm*), *gir* (*de pul begir uma*), etc.

همهء ائمه این کوی (96) , کوی دی بود[1] (66), بتوان ایشان نه با اهل آن کوی برایشان حمل (85 v.), میکویند کرده بی, etc.

(*d*) Probably the same form, but with the addition of the suffix *-a*, appears in several cases: (38) اندوزه,[2] (80, 115 v., etc.) بذیره, (136) شماره, (140 v.) اندازه (141 v.) بنداره, etc. (cf. P. Horn, op. cit., 174).[3]

(*e*) Such instances as (9 v.) جوینده نا یافتنی زندانیست ('seeking after things which cannot be found is a punishment') and (94 v.) عیش کوارنده زندکانیست ('pleasure is the enjoyment of life') suggest, on an analysis of the context, that such participial forms are used here instead of the infinitive.

(*f*) The usual formation of the abstract noun with the suffix *-agī* may be also regarded as a sort of substitute for the infinitive: (16) از این افتادکی کی بر خیزم.

II. *Participles.* (*a*) The present participle ending in *-ā* appears here very rarely, almost exclusively in such

[1] Nafaḥāt, 116, گوئی که دی بود.

[2] For its meaning see the list of rare words, E, No. 4.

[3] May it be possible that these forms are similar to the verbal nouns in some Caspian dialects, also with a suffix *-a*? (cf. W. Geiger, op. cit., 369, in the dialect of Tālish).

forms as روا and سزا (which are used impersonally),[1] and occasionally بینا and گویا

(*b*) The form with *-ān* is here more common and preserves its verbal or gerundival sense: (16) جون مرغ افتان وخیزان (141), آنرا خواهان وطالبند (19), برواز کنان (119) همه خلق آنرا جویانند, etc.[2]

(*c*) The present participle in *-anda* is quite common here and fully preserves its verbal nature: (34) بازدارنده, از هزار تن برسنده است که تصوّف جیست (52), تو بود etc. As we have seen above, this form is used occasionally with the suffix of the comparative degree *-tar*.[3]

(*d*) The past participle seems to have nothing particular about it. It appears often in the sense of a past tense without the auxiliary verb, and although in some cases it is easy to reconstruct the original perfect or pluperfect, in others it is extremely difficult.

(*e*) The future participle (similar to those in Latin in *-urus* and *-ndus*), formed from the full infinitive by the suffix *-i*, is quite common here: (16) از بودنی کی گریزم

[1] There are many similar participles, as *guyå*, *dånå*, *binå*, etc., in the colloquial, but they seem to be treated, as often in the literary language, as ordinary adjectives.

[2] This form of the present participle can be regarded as non-existent in the more simple kind of colloquial.

[3] The present participle generally is as rarely used in the simple colloquial as the infinitive. This form (in *-anda*) is also borrowed from the literary language and treated as an adjective. Cf. W. Geiger, op. cit., 399, and D. Lorimer, op. cit., 465.

کیفیت او (74 v.) مولی فرا بودنی کفت که باش (18) دانستنی نیست, etc.[1]

3. *Tenses and Modes.* I. *Indicative.* (*a*) The present tense has nothing particular about it except a few instances of phonetic confusion in the suffixes of the 1st person of the singular and plural, as mentioned above (A, 1, *a*).

(*b*) The preterite, which usually is quite normal here, occasionally, however, shows some undoubtedly old peculiarities. Whenever the suffixes *-i* or *-īd*[2] are added for expression of the conditional, subjunctive, or simply historical cohesion of the actions indicated by the verbs in question, they are joined directly to the preterite stem, thus resembling closely the similar usage in Pehlevi.[3] The personal suffixes are entirely omitted on such occasions, and although in a book as Ṭabaqāt the narrative involves mostly the forms of the 3rd person, there are many examples for other forms as well: (74) ارنه کسائی وی کوید هر که جیزی (100) ,ایدمن در عراق نبید[4]

[1] Cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 153. It is very interesting that while the original base of this form is not popular at all in the colloquial, this future participle is very common. It has various shades of meaning, but a sense of the future seems to be essentially inherent in it.

[2] About it see later on, section 6.

[3] Cf. Salemann, op. cit., p. 314. Examples of a similar use of the preterite with the suffix *-i* are numerous in the old language, and P. Horn, op. cit., 151–2, quotes several of them, as (*Shāhnāma*, Vullers, 1672) اکر من نرفتی بماز ندران, etc.

[4] Naf., 142, اکرنه ابوبکر کسائی بودی من درعراق نبودمی.

مشکل شدی برمن مصطفی‌را بخواب دیدی و ازوی ار من (117 v.) کاشکی ما آنجا بودی (94 v.) برسیدی[1], etc. ابو بکر قرّا ندیدی من صوفی نبودی (For examples of this use of the preterite with the suffix *-īd* see later on, section 6.)

(*c*) The perfect and pluperfect are formed and used quite normally except when they receive the modal particles *bi* or even *mī* (see later on, 5). The forms of the substantive verb will be discussed in a special section (8).

(*d*) There are a few instances of the 'second future' (cf. P. Horn, op. cit., 155): (18) هر کز کسی جنان نستوده باشد. A very strange form of the same (or a peculiar optative ?) appears on f. 107: اورا بقران و سنت بشناختی (? باش or باشی =) اورا بدو بشناخته بی. In the present-day colloquial this 'second future' is very common.

(*e*) The usual 'definite' future (with خواستن) occasionally receives *bi* as well (see later on, section 5, *c*, 5).

II. *The imperative mode* is occasionally used in the form of the 2nd person of the singular of the present tense (common in the colloquial): (40) کن, and later in the same sentence کنی, (44) بس وجود حق می دعا کنی (for کن), (102) نشوی, etc. The imperative is often used

[1] Naf., 227, gives دیدمی . . . پرسیدمی.

here with *mī*, and if the prohibitive and negative particles *ma-* and *ni* are used, *bi-* is frequently added to them. A strange form (if not a mistake) may be noted on fol. 38 v.: هرگز فرا تو نخواهم گفت که تو ام جیزی داد (unfortunately Nafaḥat gives no parallel sentence). In the 'dubitative' sense, as an admission of possibility, the imperative also appears: (63) گفت به نبذیری گفتم بو که بذیرم, (133 v.) باش اکنون مانه درویشانیم, etc.[1]

III. *The precative* (or 'direct' optative) is here represented by few instances: (28 v.) الله ترا بخویشتن از خویشتن بمکناد ترا بخویشتن از خویشتن بمبراد ترا از خویشتن بمپوشاد, (29) خدا دهاد, etc.[2]

4. *The passive.* Nothing peculiar can be noticed in this connexion, only a few forms are not very common, as (18) دیده برتو آمد.[3]

5. *The Modal Particles bi and mī.* (*a*) It may seem that in Anṣārī's time the sense of modality added by both these particles to the original form of the verb with which

[1] In the earlier language the expression تا بو که is common, but I cannot remember many examples like the one given above in the text. (The contemporary colloquial equivalent of this expression is *balki*, rarer *kåshki*.)

[2] It is somewhat strange to find that the authors of the more recent grammars invariably call this form conditionalis or conjunctive, etc. It may be taken for certain that even if it recalls the ancient conditionalis, etc., it is in the Modern Persian only optative or rather 'precative'.

[3] Similar formations are not uncommon to the vulgar form of the present colloquial, and can be regarded as rather impersonal.

they are used in every particular case, was not felt as strongly as at present. Sometimes they are apparently left out, judging from the context and from the point of view of their present use, as *mī* in (30) بوی نسبت کند (119) تواز بامداد تا جاشتگاه شربت و کوارش خوری, etc.

But more frequently they appear, as it would seem, quite pleonastically or even in contradiction with the original sense of the verbal form as when *bi* or even *mī* are used with the perfect, pluperfect, future, etc.

Moreover, although logically they might be expected to paralyse each other, there are a great number of instances in which they appear together (especially in negative forms): (39 v.) یکی از طلب می بماند, (21) بنه می دید (57), بای من کران شد بنمی توانم رفت (57 v.), بنمی دانست (131), بنمی کرفت (72 v.), بنه می بذیرند کفت, etc.

The same is the case when these particles are accompanied by the verbal suffix *-i*, also believed to express the sense of duration (called by the grammarians یای استمراری). The examples of its use with *mī* are very common. Therefore I will give here only some of those with *bi:* (66 v.) از هر کس خواستمی که آن مرا هر گه که سخن شنیدی (127), بنه بسندیدی (68 v.), بنوشتی خویشتن فرو میکرفت (ibid.), از وی زعقهء بلند بزدی

بنه‌دیدی (129 v.), جنانکه از هرموی وی آب بجکیدی (134 v.) نبکشتی, etc.

(*b*) *mī-* appears in its old form as همی only very rarely, probably on account of the modernization of the text: (31 v.) پاك همی کردند, (70 v.) همی رسید, (89) دربغداد همی رفت.[1] It is also noteworthy that *mī* is almost systematically separated from its verb by various words.[2] Every page furnishes several examples of this, as (19) جون می جدا خواست شد, (79 v.) وی‌را می بزرك داشتی, etc.

This particle is added to almost all tenses, even to the perfect, as in (25) بزرك می داشته اند, (113 v.) می ردّ

[1] It is difficult to say how much the modernization of the text by the later scribes is to be blamed for the disappearance of *hamī*. A book, which was probably written at exactly the same time as the Ṭabaqāt, in the district of Jām, a dependency of Herat, by the celebrated saint Aḥmad-i-Jām, shows also a tendency to avoid this archaic form. It is انس التائبین, often referred to above. At the same time, the books composed before and even after that period, but which reached us in older copies, prefer to write *hamī* very often, as is the case with the *Tadhkira* of ʿAṭṭār, from Nishapur, *Asrāru't-tawḥīd* by Ibn-Munawwar, who apparently wrote it in Abīward or Tūs, the translation of Ṭabari's *Tafsīr* (see above, note on p. 23), made probably in Bukhara, etc. Therefore, it is impossible to come to definite conclusions, and it would be more cautious to believe that the copyists have done much to damage the texts in this connexion.

[2] The book of Aḥmad-i-Jām, mentioned in the preceding note, which tries to use the highest standard of the literary language, very often, nevertheless, cannot avoid a similar order of words. This may prove that it was very common in the colloquial of that time, although it might be regarded as 'rustic'.

کرده اند, etc.,[1] and is very common with the imperative.

(*c*) *bi-* (written joined to or separated from the verb) is used in various ways: (1) with the infinitive, as mentioned above in this section, 2, I, *a*, on p. 338.

(2) With the prohibitive *ma-* of the imperative (as well as with *ni-* in similar circumstances): (31) ازان هیچ بمخور, (54) بمه بسند, (147 v.) بمکذر; or with *ni*: (53) مرا بنه کوئی, (141 v.) بنشنو, etc.

(3) With the enclitic form of the substantive verb ام، ای، اند (see later on, p. 357).

(4) With all past tenses, preterite, perfect, as in خلق بکشته (93 v.), بفروخته است (45), بداده اند (11 v.), بیامرزیده ام[2] (136 v.), درتاریخ بیاورده اند (131 v.), اند etc. Pluperfect, as in برفته بود (22 v.), جهل سال (56 v.) بپوشیده بود (91), بنکذشته بود (72 v.), بنخفته بود (130 v.), بکذرده بود (136 v.), بیامرزیده بود, etc.

(5) A very rare construction, where *bi* is added to the future, can be noted on f. 26 v.: و بخواهندت سوخت.

(*d*) Probably archaic or local are the traces of the frequent

[1] Cf. P. Horn, op. cit., p. 154.

[2] This is not uncommon in the colloquial and the dialects: *tå ze pizkhanda bare bike wagaw bandåkhtäi*, 'when, smiling with the upper lip, thou hast thrown the cheek and mole into a dimple' (from Nayyir, in Sabzawari).

use of فرا, now entirely forgotten except in compounds.[1] It appears to be an equivalent of *bi*, not only forming the dative but very often taking the place of that particle with verbs: (4) فرا خواهند, (133) فرا بوشد, (140 v.) دور (82 v.) ازآن بازارك فرا سازند (74) فرا اوكند, فرا بوده, etc. But it is somewhat difficult to specify every case because فرا may be simply a preposition, while originally the verb may not require a prefix.

6. *Suffixes of verbal coherency.* The suffix *-i*, which gives a verb in a proposition the sense of connexion with another, conditional, historical (as participation in a complex action), or causal (explicative), and which therefore may be called the suffix of verbal coherency—a sort of verbal *iḍāfa*—appears here very frequently. In the present colloquial it is extremely rare, and in the dialects it is doubtful whether it exists at all.[2] In the literary language we can trace its gradual disappearance since the earliest period. It is often taken for a particular suffix of the conditionalis, etc., but it is hardly really that. In an isolated verb it conveys no definite modal idea (while the particles *bi* and *mī* do), and its most essential peculiarity is that it appears invariably only in verbal *groups*, and in these combinations only its full value is manifested. The analysis of the examples shows that whenever it is used as '*-i* of the narrative'

[1] In Aḥmad-i-Jām's book it is used as freely as here. (Its presence in the Nafaḥāt may be explained as only the result of Jami's carelessness as to the style of his book.)

[2] Personally I heard this suffix on one or two occasions in Southern Khorasan, but my materials, collected there, are not available to me at present.

or 'of duration', its force is not sufficient, and this is why *mī* or *bi* are usually added to the verb notwithstanding the presence of the *-i* at the end. There are also many cases where *-i* is not added to all connected verbs of the sentence, and this may prove that this suffix was not as essential as, e.g., the personal suffixes, etc.[1]

The frequent use of this suffix may be regarded, therefore, as a really archaic feature of the language. Its origin is traced back to the Pehlevi particles (of the same use) *haδ*, *hēδ*, *hē* (C. Salemann, op. cit., pp. 313 and 315), which are themselves of rather uncertain origin (ibid., 313). And one of the most interesting surprises which the old-fashioned Herati speech offers to the linguist is that it preserves this suffix in an undoubtedly much more archaic form ـيد—, which cannot be anything else but the Pehlevi particle *hēδ*, just mentioned above. The use of this suffix strictly follows that of *-i*, but while the latter is added here occasionally to the personal verbal terminations (and even to the optative as on f. 88,[2] این سرك وقت خود كه داری بنازدار كه جاويد بادی ?), the former is usually added only to the preterite stem, for all persons and numbers. I noticed only one instance of its being joined to the 3rd pers. plur. in (64 v.) هر گه ويرا گفتنديد كه فلان كس

[1] It seems that these subdivisions of the 'classes' of the suffix *-i*, as many other constructions of traditional grammar, are based on logical speculations, and have nothing to do with the real synthetic study of the language. P. Horn's attempt to revise these elaborate 'hair-splittings' in a more scientific way cannot be called quite successful. It is difficult to agree with him (op. cit., 151–2) that this suffix has much optative sense in it, and still less with his opinion that it appears as a *prefix* (this is quite a different matter, and the prefixes *e-*, *i-*, etc., are connected with the dialectical particles *ha*, *he*, etc., similar in their use to *bi*).

بمرد وی گفتید[1], and not many instances of its use with the present stem: (67 v.) اگر من ترا نمیخواهید و نمی آرید و نمی خوانید[2], (73 v.) ار من نخواهید میگوئید.

The examples are very numerous (over two hundred cases), and therefore I will reproduce here only the more typical:

(*a*) *Condition* (with *agar*): (9 v.) گفت ار من بجستن ار ما دیدن تو (20), تو یافتید من در حسرت تو بگداختید ار نه آنستی که (25), دوست نمیدارید دیرستی تا ترا ببردید ار نه آن (59 v.), تو میگوئی الله ما همه بغداد بسوختید گر من (65 v.), بودید که دانستم . . . زهرهٔ من پاره شدید در تو عاصی شدید تو بامن چه کردید گفت ترا بسوختید اگر مرا بنزدیك تو هیچ قیمتی بودی مرك (68) ارخرقانی برجاید و محمد قصاب (83), من بین المنزلین بودید اگر ایشان کافر (120), من شمارا بمحمد قصاب فرستادید بودید الله تعالی ایشانرا راه نمودید, etc.

(*b*) *Casual and explicative consequence* (so-called

[1] Not in the Nafaḥāt.

[2] Naf., 121, اگر من ترا نخواستمی نخواندمی و نیاوردمی.

In the same way Jami changes all these uncommon forms if he finds it necessary to reproduce the sentences in which they occur. He is particularly fond of this suffix *-i*, and uses it even in those cases in which it is omitted in the Ṭabaqāt.

وی نه آئینه روشن (68) :(تا and که 'subjunctive', with
من شمارا (83) ,کردید که بسخن وی دلها روشن شدید
بمحمد قصاب فرستادید که وی شمارا سود تر دارید
بانك کرك کردید تاجای که سك بودید آواز دادی بان (90)
خضر در (134 v.),حیّ شدی ویارانرا جیزی آوردی ازطعام[1].
مجلس او می بودید که وی سخن می کفتید, etc.

(c) *Participation in a narrative*: (47) بدر وی جام
کویدکه (من) شب شنبه نشسته بودید و (58) ,فروختید
از بس بیران که دیده بودید (ibid.) ,مادر بر من می کرستید
انجا که خلق را تاریکی (ibid.) ,و سخنان که اشنوده بودید
شیخ هرکز جنین (6) ,بود دیدار اورا روشنائی بودید
جون روز عید بودید درخانه باز کردی (68 v.) ,نکردید
زنکی دیدم سیاه هرکه الله یاد کردید (70) ,(کردند)
واز (78 v.) ,من هرکز دعا نکردید (73 v.) ,سفید کشتی
(82 v.) ,کرمی که بوده خواستند که دست من بسوختید
همه شب (ibid.) ,(وی) خاموش کم بودید یا در نماز بودی

[1] Naf., 183.

از کور وی آواز (90), فریاد میکردید وسخن میکفتید قران خواندن می شنودید هر کس که بزیارت وی شدی[1] بوی آمدی ویرا بدیدی و آنچه خواستید ببرسیدید (108) (117), زاری بروی افتاد کاستید که تباه شدید (111 v.) بیربسین شب رمضان سجده کردید و تا صبح می زاریدید از بزرکان بنوحه نیوشیدی و بکرستید (132), و میکفتی کاههـا بکوشیدید ویرا هیـج مکس نـدیدید[2] (134 v.) باز (135 v.), نهـاوندی دیك نبختید تا مهمان نـبودی (135) هر که در مجلس وی نعره (138 v.), کردید و آمد بهری زدید وی دربرابر آن نعره باز زدید, etc.

7. *Suffix of emphasis.* The suffix -*ā*, used with exclamations and probably intended to convey the idea of the logical accentuation placed on the verb, appears here rarely, only in a somewhat dialectical sentence: (73 v.) با حفص بغـاوردان[3] (تا) باسی ازشب بر بـیـل (?) خفته و میکفت کاری که بد اش نا بده و انچه نـبـدهٔ (*sic*) اش بده جون کنما جون کنما. Jami in his Nafaḥāt (127) renders

[1] Naf., 183.
[2] Naf., 312.
[3] So in Nafaḥāt, 127.

it in this way: کاری که بوده است نا بوده چون کنم چون کنم.[1]

8. *Auxiliary verbs.* (*a*) $\sqrt{ah}$. The enclitic forms of this stem are used quite normally.[2] There is only one strange form, probably a dialectic 3rd pers. sing. هن[3]: (41)[4] وی در بلخ گفت که بو منصور مارا بسر آمد جنان هن.

The form of the 3rd pers. sing. است appears (positive and negative) with the suffixes *-i* or *-īd*: (25) ار نه آنستی که تو میگوئی الله ما همه بغداد بسوختید, (20 v.) (وی را) اگر انکار عالم نیستی از ین کار نشان نیستی, (21 v.)[5] ار نیستید (3rd pers.), etc. The same است

[1] This suffix, which quite probably, as P. Horn (op. cit., 152) thinks, is of the same nature as *-ā* of the vocative case, does not exist in the present colloquial and dialects (except in the expressions borrowed from the literary language, such as *khudâyâ shukr*, etc.). Therefore, the example above, which undoubtedly belongs to the colloquial (or even a dialect) spoken at that time, is interesting evidence that this form was really 'living' and used in speech.

[2] Except in the case where they receive the prefix *bi* (if it is really so, cf. later on, subsection (*b*) of the present section).

[3] This form is very strange, because it recalls those used in the dialects of Fars (see O. Mann, op. cit., 26, 37–8), while in Khorasan, at present, no traces of it are found (cf. W. Geiger, op. cit., 398, and D. Lorimer, op. cit., 461–2).

[4] On the margin is added یعنی جنانکه می بایست, which is probably the conjecture of one of the scribes.

[5] The addition of the cohesive suffix *-i* to است is quite common in the old language. It is particularly frequent in the old Persian Tafsīr (mentioned on pp. 20–1) in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,

appears in a strange way: (18) جون من کیست که این مر تبه‌را بسندیدم. On f. 9 v. even the 2nd pers. is formed from it: جو نستی (تو).[1]

The most prominent, however, in the language of the Tabaqāt is another form of the 3rd pers. sing., i.e. اید or, written joined, ید — or, after a vowel, ئید —. I took it first for آید because in the old texts this word is occasionally used in the sense 'to become' (cf. C. Salemann, op. cit., 315–316, and P. Horn, op. cit., 154),[2] and that it really is in many cases. But this meaning does not always fit it as in the frequent quite 'static' sentences وی شاکرد فلان اید or وی استاد بغدادیان اید, etc., because the statement is one purely of fact, not of 'becoming'. The cases in which this word is used as an enclitic verbal suffix dispel all doubts, because this could not be possible with آید where آ is the stem.[3] There is

Aa 7. The same is the case with the language of the انس التا ئبین mentioned above, where even a plural form appears with the same suffix as on f. 33, اکر این علما بد نیستندی, etc. The instance of نیستید (3rd pers. sing., with the suffix *-īd*) mentioned here is the only one I came across in the Ṭabaqāt.

[1] These forms seem not to be frequent.

[2] Not rarely used in even the more 'rustic' forms of the colloquial at present (as well as the verb *räftän*) instead of *shudan*.

[3] It is very difficult to suppose that the original *ā* was shortened and could then disappear. It becomes *i* or *e* in some Kurdish dialects, but the whole character of the language of the Ṭabaqāt does not permit to suggest such accidental possibilities of analogy.

even one more circumstance in favour of this admission. Not only does the spelling ـيد after vowels prove that the pronunciation ought to be *-īd*, but through the whole copy, although the scribe wrote first آيد, the *madda* was erased later, and there are traces of erasion found almost invariably at every occurrence. This careful correction suggests that the manuscript from which the present copy was made possessed special authority and authenticity in the eyes of those who were copying it, otherwise they would not do this, and this conjecture adds to the significance of the fact.

It seems that in this *-īd* we have the missing link in the row of enclitic verbal forms of this stem (replaced by است), and it may be the prototype of the suffix of the 3rd pers. sing. of the present tense *-ad* (which in Pehlevi was still *-ēδ*). There can be no doubt that it goes back apparently to the ancient Persian *aitiy* and Avestan *aeⁱti* (see Bartholomae, "Awestasprache," *G.I.Ph.*, I, i, 202), which seems to have survived till a comparatively later period in the other part of the Iranian world, i.e. in the Soghdian, as *χaci*.[1] If so, we can claim great antiquity for this form. An interesting question arises in this connexion. The 3rd pers. sing. of the substantive verb was usually reproduced in the Pehlevi books with an ideogram איתּ (C. Salemann, op. cit., 313), spelt in Pazend as *hast*. Its likeness to our form ايد is remarkable. There was another ideogram for the same form הוה, and it is extremely tempting to believe that the former, איתּ, was originally *not* an ideogram but a *phonetic*

[1] In that language the 3rd pers. sing. *sti* is also used. It would be extremely interesting if the students of Soghdian could discover a definite difference in the use of both.

reproduction of a word, which in the earlier period was used everywhere, but for some reason was forgotten later and became a kind of symbol, the phonetical value of which was taken from the other more fashionable and up-to-date form of speech.

The examples of it are very numerous: (47 v.) نیازو, (119 v.) اوّل کسی که برمنبر آشکارا کرد اوئید, (60 v.) تعلّم علم محض وشرع صاف افلاس دکان اوئید, (64 v.) ار تو آکاهید[1] ازو که من همه سخنان ممشادید, (73 v.) ار نه آنید[2] که او کفته آکاهم حال تو بر هم بکردد, (ibid.) آن نه آنید که[3] دعا نباید که ارمن نخواهید میکو ئید, (17 v.) ار نه آنید که کفتند ذکرًا کثیرًا هرکز کرد, (123) نکزارید که زبان من کرد یاد تو کردید یاد کردرا وآن آنید که . . . etc.

(*b*) $\sqrt{bw}$. The forms derived from this stem are quite regular in the preterite (often used with *bi* as ببود, etc.). In the present tense some deviations from the standard

[1] This is an extremely strange use of ید — which could be taken here for *-id* as the cohesive suffix, if the word to which it was added were a verb. Therefore we must take it either for the form of the 2nd pers. or the 3rd pers. sing.

[2] Naf., 141, ا کرنه آن بودی.

[3] Naf., 142, آن نه آنست که.

forms can be noticed. Cases of the present tense from بو (except 3rd pers. sing.) are rare: (35) اینان بدو کیتی بی‌او فرا نمی بوند, and a few others. As rare are the forms from باش, as in (51 v.) اهل حقیقت کی باشی که از زندکانی باشی, etc.

Instead of these some other peculiar forms are used:

Sing. 1st pers. بم, 2nd pers. بی, 3rd pers. —? (بید ?).

Plur. 1st pers. —? (بیم ?), 2nd pers. بید, 3rd pers. بند.[1]

I cannot take upon myself to decide whether (1) they are the result of the change of the original *u* into *i*,[2] and then shortened; or (2) they are the enclitic forms of the substantive verb with the addition of the particle *bi*.[3] Both explanations are equally possible, but to me the first theory seems more probable.

These are the examples:

1st pers. sing. (35) من بتو برهان ده که خاموش بم, (37) من ور آنجا جون شاد نبم[4] که بر عالم تو میکذ شتم, (92 v.)

[1] Similar forms are very common all over Persia, not only in the dialects (cf. W. Geiger, op. cit., 366, in the Caspian group, 398, in the Central dialects, about which also D. Lorimer, op. cit., 463, 464, and O. Mann, op. cit., 37–8, for the dialects of Fars), but in the colloquial of the cities as well. Except in the Caspian dialects, however, these forms usually convey the idea of the past tense.

[2] At present it is one of the most prominent phonetic phenomena of Khorasani Persian, and the usual بود is frequently *bi* here.

[3] If *bi* may be prefixed to the past tense of the substantive verb, why cannot it be added to the present as it is usually added to other verbs?

[4] Naf., 76, نباشم.

ار من باین بآخرت شوم[1] من که بم[2] و بر (107) ,جنان بم
جه بم, etc.

2nd pers. sing. (34) تا پاپس نمانی درهر جه بی بزندکانی
آن کنج کجا (105) ,تو نبی نبی او بود (43) ,بی نه بکرا هیت
آنجه از تو اید خجل بی و هرجه از (140 v.) ,بود که تو نبی
آن آنست که ذکررا ملازم (ibid.) ,او اید بآن راضی بی
بی و مشاهده را ملازم بی همواره رقیب ازل بی وکوش و
آن سبق خوئی تو فرا اوکند (اوکن?) از دنیا سیر آئی
و باخود به بیکاری بی, etc.

3rd pers. sing. ?

1st pers. plur. ? I have not noticed any instances.

2nd pers. plur. (133) فرفته نه بید.

3rd pers. plur. (107 v.) همه خلق در بادیه تشنه بند.

An interesting case of the suffix *-īd* added to this form of the substantive verb was quoted already: (74) ار نه کسائی ایدمن در عراق نبید.

From the examples given here it seems quite clear that if it would be necessary to replace these peculiar forms

[1] Naf., 243, روم.

[2] Ibid., باشم, etc. In this way Jami usually renders these peculiar forms.

by those of Standard Persian, in many cases the best substitute would be the forms of the preterite and not of the present. This is why the suggestion seems more likely to be correct that they are derived from بو, in which the original *u* was, under some dialectic influence, altered into *i*.

(*c*) √*st*. The verb ایستادن in our text can hardly be taken for an auxiliary.

(*d*) *shudan* has no peculiarities (except those mentioned above, A, 4, on p. 22).

(*e*) *khwāstan* is used with the apocopated infinitive not only in the cases where it appears as an auxiliary verb, but even where it retains its original sense of 'to wish', as in (26) بحجّ خواست رفت or (63) بحجّ خواست شد etc. At the same time: (35) او که رفتن میخواهد, etc. The case where it is used with *bi* when forming a 'definite' future was mentioned above (5, *b*, 5, on p. 347).

(*f*) *tuwānistan* is not only frequently used with the apocopated infinitive of the chief verb for all persons in the same form of the present stem (as on f. 141 v. بتوان ساخت, etc.), but, if this is not simply a mistake, the main verb receives its original personal suffix: (66 v.) صفت نتوان کفتم (for صفت نتوانم کفت), etc.

(*g*) *dānistan*. It is a rather archaic feature of the language of the Ṭabaqāt that this verb in the same way is constructed with the apocopated infinitive.[1] This does

[1] Cf. E. Browne, "An old Persian Commentary," *JRAS*, 1894, 438.

not happen consistently, however: (87) برنای بود جیزی دو تن دیده ام که ازوی بدانست خواند, etc., but (82 v.) سخن باز دانست کفتن, etc.

(*h*) *shāyistan* is frequently used in personal forms: شایم که مرا ازاهل توحید کردی (37), تراشایم نه دلم (16 v.), نشائی . . . بشائی (36) (see F, *a*, on p. 378), etc.

(*i*) *bāyistan* appears often in the form of وایدِ, etc.: نوایدِ (37), وی را بوایست کریخت (136), etc. It is even used with the suffix -*i*, discussed above (section 6), as in اکر او ترا نمی بایدی (91 v.), etc.

8. *Impersonal expressions.* The verbs just mentioned above are used impersonally in a quite normal fashion. But there are sometimes rather uncommon constructions, as: (35) او که آرزوی رفتن است 'because he wishes to go', (113) [1] مرا نان . . . آرزو کرد 'I wanted some bread', (90) آرزومندمست باید که (!), probably simply 'I want that . . .'

D. *Particles*

1. *Negative particles.* Both نه and نا are often confused, but no general rule in this connexion can be deduced. The examples are very common, as (19 v.)

[1] It seems to have been the usual form of expressions of this type; cf. E. Browne, op. cit., *JRAS*, 1894, 440, and R. Nicholson, *Tadhkira*, vol. ii, introd., 11.

ذرّهء تر نا شده (115), نا توانم کفت, etc., where we would expect نه.[1]

2. *Prepositions.* Some of them seem to be used in a really archaic way, but there are traces of modern (or local) prepositions as well.

اندر appears here rarely (16, 69, 129).

از used in a strange sense in (129) از آب نکون اندر افتاد (mistake for در ?).

با assumes various forms and is, in some cases, not very common :

(1) With the dative instead of به: (21 v.) با دنیا داری, (31) افتادی, (104) باز با سر ان شد, با وطن خود میروی (107) کم با دید آئی (119 v.), با سر و قت خود شد (122) با جای نهادم, etc.

(2) Is spelt occasionally وا, as in (138) وا حقیقت etc. (see above, A, 4, on pp. 21–2).

(3) Sometimes appears as فا: (107) فا تو سخن کوید, etc.

(4) Takes the form of باز before pronouns beginning with

[1] This seems to be quite common in the old language, and a similar confusion is still observed in Khorasan.

a vowel[1]: (15) بازو کردد, (41 v.) کس بازو نمیتواند (52 v.) ترا بازان, (72 v.) رفت کار نیست, etc.

(5) Apparently simply a phonetic variation of the previous form is فاز: (95 v.) فازوی نکرم, (60) فازان نداده ام, (56 v.) فازین درویش دهد, etc.

بر is very commonly used, as in the colloquial, instead of the به of the dative, sometimes in a vulgar (or old?)[2] form ور (for examples see above, A, 4, on p. 21). The old form ابر is found on very rare occasions (as f. 56 v. ابر طریقت).

به, as mentioned above (A, 3, on p. 20), often appears before pronouns, beginning with a vowel, in the form بد.

[1] The final *z* in باز (فاز) and فراز is undoubtedly an archaism because it goes back to *ž* of the Pehlevi *frāž* and *awāž* (see C. Salemann, op. cit., 319). It is remarkable that it appears only before the initial vowels of the pronouns, as *d*, the old *t*, and after δ in *paδ* = بد for به.

These forms, فراز، فرا، فاز، باز, are not common in other books, and therefore it was a kind of indirect evidence in favour of their being regarded as dialectic to find them in the book of Aḥmad-i-Jām, who uses them very freely.

[2] In the present 'rustic' forms of the Khorasani colloquial *bär* and *wär* seem usually to take the place of به and برای.

تو, which is regarded usually as vulgar and modern (cf. P. Horn, op. cit., 162), is noticed here only once: (115) مجرد توجهان توئی (without the *iḍāfa*, as in the colloquial).

سو and سر (at present very common all over Persia in many various forms as *sī*, *si̯*, *súne*, *síne*, etc.) appear here very often, as (65 v.) نه حلالست بسوی ما, etc.[1]

فرا is very common instead of به (even verbal sometimes, as above, 5, *d*, on p. 347). Occasionally it corresponds to the more modern برای, which *does not appear here at all.*[2] The examples are very numerous and a few will be quite sufficient: (78 v.) اکر ملوك دنیا دانند که من ایذر فرا جه, (5) ام بشمشیر فرا سر من آیند, (8) فرا من کفت, (17) فرا من رسید, (24) من فرا خواب نمی شدم

[1] This preposition may be regarded as peculiar to Fars, where it takes the place of the Khorasani *wär*. Its applications are manifold, as *sit* means برای تو (cf. O. Mann, op. cit., 52), *si kâzerún* instead of به کازرون, etc. In Khorasan it is not very common and used only to show direction, as in *sune shār* سوی شهر, etc.

[2] فرا is used as commonly in Aḥmad-i-Jām's book, but I noticed some cases of برای as well.

فرا درآمد, etc. A case, which may be a psychological mistake, where the author wrote به, but for some reason found it more suitable to use here فرا, and forgot to erase the former, is found on f. 28 بفرا دیدن آوردن.

Although instances of فرا وی, etc., are common, before pronouns beginning with a vowel the other form فراز appears more frequently, which is apparently quite analogous to the باز and فاز mentioned above.[1] The examples are numerous: (70 v.) فرازو راه هست, (94) فرازو میکویند که دعا کن, (105) فرازو افتادم, (104) رو فرازو کنی, (77) فرازین کار می نکریست, etc.

3. *Adverbs.* Of more or less archaic adverbs only ایذر (or ایدر) can be mentioned (53 v., 68, 75, 78, 88, 91, etc.).

بر is used occasionally as an adverb: (131) ترا فرو نشانند و مرا بر نشانند, etc.

فرا as an adverb also appears several times: (19) از من فرا ست, (20) فراتر نشسته, etc.

آنجا as commonly in the old language, is used with

[1] Cf. above, n. 1 on p. 362.

reference to time: (73) سفر جکنی انجا که ارادت تو درواخ شود.

E. *Vocabulary of rare words and uncommon expressions*

In the list given here are included (*a*) the words which seem to be local and which are not common in the literary language of the same period as that of the Ṭabaqāt, (*b*) the words which are not rare, but which appear in our text in a somewhat uncommon sense, and (*c*) the expressions which, although quite common, may be traced at present to a particular province of Persia outside which they are not current. On the contrary many words, which can nowadays be regarded as archaic, such as تیمار، تاوان، پذیره، پاس، پاداش، انکاریدن، آشامیدن etc., and which one never hears in the colloquial, are omitted.

آزرم 'pain, sorrow': (96) سخن او نه بطاقت خلق بود که توحید آزرم نبود.

اکین? (has perhaps something to do with the Pehlevi *akwīn*, cf. C. Salemann, op. cit., 289, 'zusammen'?). Here only one case: (89 v.) این خلق که می بینی همه اکین بهشتند. Jami in the Nafaḥāt, 182, reproduces this sentence literally (he writes آکین).

آمیختن as a trans. verb in the sense of 'to console': (16) ناجاره را جون آمیزم.

اندوزه 'thought, care, anxiety' ?: (38) اگر ملك دنیا دارد ازآن تو ازوی دریغ نداری و جون داری آنرا قیمت ننهی و اندوه برآن نخوری و اندوزه نکنی (in the Nafaḥāt it is omitted).

انکشتن for انگیختن ?: (38 v.) درجهٔ وی را محسوب نکرد و بنه انکشت (omitted in Naf.).

باتله (پاتله) 'caldron' (دیك). Apparently a dialectical word now used only amongst the Parsiwans of the Herat province (f. 72 *in margine*).

بازانك (perhaps for باذانك from دانستن ?)[1]: (124) درعلوم این طائفه بازانك بود (Naf. omitted).

باسیدن (verb derived from پاس) 'to watch': (126) بیفتاد بباسیدند برفته بود.

بافتابه apparently a mistake for پایتابه 'putties': (86) بای در بافتابه دارد.

[1] Cf. below, نازان in the present list, and also A, 3, p. 20. I cannot remember having ever seen or heard بادان, of which this word may be a diminutive. On the other hand, the more natural reading of this expression نازانك (نادانك) would be in contradiction with the context.

10 ازآن (29): پوچ ?[1] 'futile', diminutive of بچلو

دنیای بچلوی شما برستم (Naf. omitted).

(الله) آنکاه بدیس (29): instruction ? (پدیس ?) بدیس

داد بتفصیل ریاضات (Naf. omitted).

برزکری husbandry, peasants' work, farming (129 v.). As far as I have found, this word is used nowadays only in the south-eastern part of Khorasan and, apparently, in the district of Farah. It is spelt *bâzgäri* (from *bâzgär*, a peasant). In Western Persia this word is not known to the people.

پنبه دانه (as further سپند دانه), instead of the usual تخم اسفند، تخم پنبه, are also expressions peculiar to the same part of Khorasan and freely used by Heratis.

بنداره (پنداره) 'thought' (141, 141 v.).

15 بوست کراه, (117) او بوست کراه بود. I regarded it first as a mistake for the more common پوست کر, but found it written in the same sentence in Nafaḥāt in the same way (213). The vocalization apparently belongs to Nassau-Lees (پوست گرُاه), and it would be interesting to find the grounds on which it was written so, because I do not find anything like this in Vullers' *Lexicon*, or anywhere else.

[1] In the rustic colloquial of Southern Khorasan similar formations are still in use, such as *kuchulu*, from *kuchak* (so it is spelt locally), *kachalu* ('bald', from *kal*), *gululä* (from the usual *ghullä*, 'bullet'), etc.

بها, here used in the sense of 'greatness, awe': (13 v.) این نور و بها بر روی و دستان وی جیست.

بیل (پیل ?) a sort of carpet?: (73) بر بیل خفته (Naf. omitted).

تاسا 'sorrow, displeasure': (15) جون بر کذرد از آن تاسا بکرفت (Naf., 69, renders it by تاسا شود, (33) ملول شدی), also on ff. 93 v., 134 v., etc.

تاوستن (apparently for تابیدن or تافتن), (14) ترا توا نا کردم تا دیدار من در تاوستی و شنوا کردم تا سخن من درتاوستی. Such expressions as این مرا بر نتا بد, etc., are very common here.

20 تشنا مار 'thirst', (84) برفته در تشنا مار (cf. کشنا مار and above, B, 1, *l*, on p. 27) (Naf. تشنکی).

جرّه (چرّه ?) 'bowl, cup?', (43) خواهی جرّه بر سنك زن خواهی سنك بر جرّه.

جم 'nature', (132 v.) (وی را) بسری رسید نه بجم و بدر از وی می رنجید. Naf., 308, translates this word by نبهنجار.

برکران (کنار) (129 v.), جورب 'socks'? (= جراب).

آتش دان نشسته بود و جورب در بای.

جولاه, an abusive expression, 'rascal, rogue,' (133 v., etc.) جولاهی آمده است مارا از درویشی می بیرون نهد (probably in a metaphoric sense as a 'weaver of intrigues', etc.; cf. جولاهك, E. Browne, op. cit., 454).

آن خار نمی (21), خار, probably a mistake for خوار, بود که برزبان تو کفت.

خا ویدن, apparently for خا بیدن (خوابیدن), (73) بر سوی ردای وی خا ویدم.

خا یکینه 'omelette' (22, 22 v.), can be regarded as a local word at present used chiefly in South-Eastern Persia (cf. Lorimer, op. cit., 429, *khiya*). It is derived from *khúy*, *khuyk* (in Central dialects, *hek* in Kurdish), which belong to the same stem as the Persian خایه, and is usually pronounced as *khuginá* or *khåginá*.

خرسته و آرائش (124) خرسته? 'show, exhibition'?, جا مه. Jami translates it in the Nafaḥāt, 305, as خردهء ظاهر وآرائش جا مه.

خسته او بیدا بود کسی که اورا (8 v.) خسته 'sickness'?,

دیده بود جان در تن او شیدا بود. Jami reproduces the whole sentence literally (Naf., 38); cf. E. Browne, op. cit., 458.

30 عبد الله خفیف (119) خویسه 'quarrel, dispute', را هنکامی با شیخ موسی عمران جیرفتی خویسه افتاد. Jami omits the whole sentence.

خینا کر 'musician', (135) خینا کری جیزی میزد.

دست درولایت درواخ زند (2) درواخ 'strong, firm': دامن وی درواخ دار (8 v.), (73, etc.). I have not been able to trace any of these sentences in the Nafaḥāt. Cf. P. Horn, Asadi's Lughat-i Furs, f. 15 (text).

دوژخ, an older form of دوزخ.

دهشت. There are two words spelt in the same way, Persian and Arabic (دهشة), but it is difficult to say which is meant here: (30) در اندیشیدن درو دهشت است و دهشت نقصان است و معرفت حیرت است. Probably the Arabic word in its sense of 'fear' will fit best.

35 بروزکار (66 v.) رازه, adverb from راز, 'secretly', (وی) رازه می بودم باصفهان.

(22) رُستی صحبت تباه کند (21 v.) رُستی 'alone'?: خا یکینه خورده (ibid.) رُستی بی یاران با براهیم رفت

بود رُستی بی یاران. (Jami omits this word in these sentences.)

زشت (112 v., etc.). This word is very common indeed in literary Persian, but I place it in this list because it seems to be also a Khorasani idiom. At present it is used in that part of Persia instead of *bad*, but is rarely heard in other provinces.

زینهار as a substantive, apparently in the sense of 'defence': (65 v.) زینهار خواست, (104 v.) وی ز ینهار زمین بود, etc.

ژند 'nonsense', (28) و این که میکو یند که وی سید عارفانست خود ژند است.

40 ساختن 'to prepare (a dead body) for funeral' (80).

ساز 'all things required for the funeral': (80) همه ساز کوری دیدم کنده وسازوحنوط وی, (ibid.) من نهاده یابید.

سبند دانه, see also بنبه دانه (سپند or اسفند, a sort of grass growing in the desert. When dry it is burnt on various occasions, and its smoke is believed to avert the effects of the evil eye).

ستردن 'to cleanse, to dry', (122) آب دهان وی می ستردید (Naf., 301, پاك می کردند).

هر جه می سکالم می (16, 17) سکالیدن 'to think': هر جه من می سکالیدم جزان می شد (140), جدا اید.

45 شاشك 'a kind of fly'? (115) شاشك خر بکزید.

Jami translates it (Naf., 256) with مگسی.

شکویدن (apparently for شکوهیدن) 'to fear' (10 v., 11 v., 52 v., etc.). One example will be sufficient: الله را بدوستی برستم که به شکویم که نه برستم (10 v.).

طرز ? (130) من و قتی در طرز خود بودم نشسته و دران ایام که وا داشته بودند مرا از مجلس (Naf., 396, ترز).

طرکست 'crackling' (121). See above, B, 1, on p. 27.

طوطلی ? (86) طوطلی نکرده بود از کسی (cheating ?).

50 فرهیونده (for فریبنده ?), (36) از فرهیونده لا اله الاّ الله دروست نیاید.

قزین, a kind of cloth, (133 v.) وی قزین بافتی (probably from قز 'silk').

کار ? (131) هم بکار بارکاه ما در کورست.

کالا 'belongings', (12) کالای خود بدست او یافتی (as Colonel G. Ranking told me, this word is common in the *Siyāsat-Nāma*).

کاهیدن, the equivalent of کاستن 'to be small,' (70) بهر جه از بهانه می کاهد از حقیقت می فزاید.

55 کرفه 'shovel' (31).

کز (for کج ?) 'wrong'? (115) خر بجست و بای او در کز آمد و درخت کزفکار شد. Jami gives (Naf., 256) افگار شد (فکار or افگار = wound). Or it may be from گزیدن 'to bite'? (the leg was caught or scratched by the thorny tree and this caused a wound).

کشنامار 'hunger' (96 v., 123, 124). See above, B, 1, *l*, on p. 27.

کلانیدن 'to shake (a carpet)', (79) سجاده فرو کلاند (now in the colloquial *takundan*, تکاندن, is used instead of it).

کن 'a cave' (still used in various places of Khorasan as an equivalent for غار), در کنی از آن کوه بای وی در نر می آمد . . . بیرون آمد از آن کن.

60 ربوبیت همه عین عبودیت است (131) ? کوسی کوسی نادانی بیجاره، (بیجارکی ?) ضعیفی بحاصل نفس فراز آمد سیدی کردد (nothing in the Nafaḥāt).

می باید که بخدایان کوك 'shriek, excitement', (138 v) خدایان هرات کوك کنم (Naf., 329, where only the word is transformed into خیابان). This word is still quite common in the same sense all over Khorasan.

کوکجه 'button' (120 v.). Obviously a diminutive of گوك 'a ball'.

هوا که عرش درآنست کویستن 'to depend'? (141 v.) آن دانش بر علم ربوبیت کویزد (144 v.) درآن نکویزد از صنائع آن جوی (145 v.) برطلب و استبشار نکویزد که بران کویزد.

ابو الادیان کنیه کردند (ویرا) که کیش 'creed', (108) درهمه کیشها مناظره کردی.

65 در مرغوزن مرغوزن 'cemetery, burial ground', (68) کوران. Cf. Asadi, *Lughat*, f. 63.

(مرا) نازان (نادان or ناذان (apparently for نازان کذاشت.

ناوغست, *see* وغستن.

نیوشیدن 'to listen' (11, 22, 26 v., 52, 75, 95 v., etc.).

وغستن (pres. stem وغند) 'to show, make clear':

با خلق بوغست (85), او می وغندد بر نبده (24 v.)

common (3 v., 4 v., 25 v., 32, 93, 143, etc.). I did not find a single instance in the Nafaḥāt, but it is perhaps possible to expect it in older MSS. of Jami's book.

70 هاریوکان 'Heratis' (for هریوکان, although always هرات and هری): (82 v.) هیچ نکرده درکار هاریوکان دور فرا بوده و بیشتر مشائخ جنان بوده اند که هاریوکان را بزرك داشته که هاریوکان نیکو دل بوده اند, (83) هاریوکان صفاتی باشند یعنی برحمت (او) پدرهاریوکان بود (131 v.), و عفو و کرم بکویند وشب و روز تیمار شهر وخلق می برد.

هسکیدن 'to discern'? (49 v.) بی تیمار جه بود یافت

(بی) هسکیدن (141 v.), بی جستن و دیدار بی هسکیدن

معرفت او بنتوان شناخت (nothing in the Naf.).

هویره 'hopeful'? (77) خدای ترا هویره کناد

(nothing in the Naf.).

یازیدن 'to extend': (16) برسزای خویش افسوس

کسی ور مقام بود بردیکری یازد این (114) . می یازم
بی ادبی بود. (Naf. omitted).

یاویدن for یافتن (see above, A, 4, on p. 21, and C, 1, on p. 337).

75 یته 'Jewish ghetto'? (107 v.) در[1] یته بنی
اسرائیل رفته.

F. *Specimens of the text of the Ṭabaqāt*

It is not easy to select from the Ṭabaqāt some typical passages which could give a more or less adequate idea of its peculiar language. The uncommon expressions, analysed above, are sporadically distributed throughout the book, and although accumulated occasionally in various places, they are sometimes separated one from the other by pages of text which present nothing particular. It is impossible, however, not to give any specimens of the text at all, and I therefore offer here some of them, which probably will be quite sufficient:

(*a*) Some of the passages to which apparently Jami alludes in the Nafaḥāt saying that they are incomprehensible. He does not reproduce them, and therefore we have no means to decide if they were really damaged. In some of them, as they appear in our MS., the 'obscurity'

[1] Apparently the same word is met with on two occasions in Professor Nicholson's edition of the *Luma'* (Gibb Mem. Ser., vol. xxii), the text, pp. 173, 215. It is spelt in the edition as تيه, but it would be interesting to learn if the original MSS. admit the reading يته. It is for the specialists in the Semitic languages to decide whether this *yata* and the Italian word ghetto are the same, or go back to a common origin.

often depends on an unusual sequence of words, which may be original.

(*b*) Jami omits also in the Nafaḥāt many of the Shaykh's moral and Sufic discussions, not directly connected with the exposition, and it will not be useless to give a page of such contents. (Here I offer one of those in which quotations from Anṣārī's *Munājāt* can be found.)

(*c*) In conclusion, a passage, which is also reproduced in the Nafaḥāt, will be useful as showing Jami's methods in dealing with the original text.

(*a*) Typically 'obscure' passages:

(5 v.) برو خواستند (خاستند ؟) بانکار وا راندن تا انکاه که از دنیا برفت.[1]

(33 v.) ای کاشکی تو بازو خالی دالی شد.[2]

(33 v.–34) در قدرت بیر و جوان کی نبود تاوانی بود کار فراخ بود وی را فرمان بود.

(34 v.) علی بن سهل کوید استادرا (*sic* ?) که فتح (موصلی) ار در خوابد (خواب بود ؟) ان مرد اکاه بود جرا نه بحق برستش ان کرفتار بود.

[1] Naf., 36, بروی بانکار بر خاستند تا انگاه که

[2] Probably an instance of تابع, something as لاف گذاف or (colloquial, S. Kh.) *lâṭ-u-pât*, etc.

(36) مکر منادمت ملوك را نشائی در خلوت که ملوك خالی بود در ایشان در مشو مکر که بشائی.

(36) ارش دوست یافت اش نور یافت ور در طلب بمبرادش (?) شفیع یافت.

Here are some specimens of the unusual sequence of words:

(126) شیخ گفت که جندین بس بود که گویند که تو برین بس میگویند در کسی آن جه تو probably for در کسی وی را قبول میگوئی. In the other example, (115 v.) فرا دید آمد بر بزرگان نیشابور, it is not that "he accepted the shaykhs of Nishapur", but, on the contrary, they accepted him, etc.

(*b*) A page from the Ṭabaqāt not reproduced by Jami:

(f. 18) شیخ الاسلام گفت که وقتی در عرفات ازین جوانمردان یکی ایستاده بود، گفت الهی من امروز ترا یادی کنم و بستایم که هرگز کسی جنان[1] نستوده باشد، در ساعت زبان او خشك شد و کنك، آخر بدل وی در آمد گفت الهی بتوبه ام، من کی توانم که بسزا ترا یاد کنم یا بستایم باین زبان آلوده خود بسزای خود،

[1] Written جان.

جنانکه (*sic*)[1] توانم مفلس وار ترا یاد کنم ، در ساعت زبان یافت ، شیخ الاسلام کفت یکجند بکسب یاد تو برزیدیم باز یکجند بیاد خود ترا نازیدم (*sic*) ، دیده بر تو آمد با نظاره[2] تو پردازیدم ، در خبر و غفلت آن همه سازیدم ، جون عیان بدید آمد از ان همه ببردازیدم ، یاد بشناختم خاموشی کزیدم ، جون من کیست که این مرتبه‌را بسندیدم ، شیخ شبلی کوید المرید ناطق و العارف اخرس ، شیخ الاسلام کفت قدس سرّه که یاد کردند (کردن *sic* for) کسبست و فراموش نکردن زندکانی ، و زندکانی ورای دو کیتی است و کسب جنانکه دانی ، فی مناجاته ، الهی دوستی نکذاشت جزز دوست و دیکر همه آوار ، ذاکر و مذکور یکی و رسم ذکر ازو یادکار ، الهی فریاد از یاد باندازه و دیدار بهنکام ، و از آشنائی بنشان و دوستی به بیغام ، واز یاد بیش از صحبت آمیختن در یاد ، الهی جه یاد کنم که همه یادم ، من جز من نشان خود فرا باد نهادم ، به بهانه من بهانه جون

[1] Perhaps چندانکه would be better? [2] Better به نظاره؟

شویم، و کفت که علّتست جون کویم[1]، جه سود از دعا و کوشش و با داش، که مولی فرا بود نی کفت که باش، الهی جز تو ترا که شاید که دریاد تو جزز تو کس نماند، جز تو ترا که داند هیجکس نتواند، و هر که ترا بخود جوید بر سزای خود فرو ماند، بتوان تو ترا (f. 18 v.) می جویند و با تو از تو میکویند، بیننده کنکست و اکاه کویاست.

(*c*) The following is a passage to show Jami's usual methods of handling the original text (f. 82 v., corresponding to the Nafaḥāt, 324):

(شیخ الاسلام کفت) ابو العباس کوینده برو همواره میکفتی خاموش کم بودید یا در نماز بودی قبلهٔ این کاران وقت او برد و[2] در ایام من بوده[3] * من میخواستم همواره[4] ومیکفتم فرا[5] شیخ عمو که سه پیر[6] میخواهم که زیارت

[1] Better کوئیم. [2] In the Nafaḥāt, 324, so far omitted.

[3] Added است همواره. [4] N. omitted from the asterisk. [5] N. با.

[6] N. different order of words با شیخ عمو میکفتم که سه پیررا میخواهم.

کنم شیخ ابو العباس قصاب[1] بآمل و شیخ احمد نصر[2] بنشابور و شیخ ابو علی سیاه بمرو ومرا[3] گفت *من خواهم رفت بهار[4] ترا[5] با خود ببرم، *او خود نبرد و[6] روزی نبود و[7] لیکن بیوسته کسی می آمدی از نزدیك وی بخانقاه[8] عمو و من احوال[9] و سخن وی می برسیدم که کس را[10] احوال و سخن وی جنان معلوم نیست که مرا، وی گفته که وقت کیمیا ست، شیخ احمد گوفانی گفت که[11] همه شب فریاد میکردید[12] و سخن میگفتید[13] بآخر گفتی[13] ما بکی شئ لیس کمثله شئ یعنی ما بقی شئ، شیخ الاسلام گفت که دو تن دیده ام که از وی سخن *باز دانست گفتن[14] یکی شیخ ابو علی (f. 83) کازر از[15] حکایت

[1] N. omitted.
[2] N. added را.
[3] N. وی.
[4] N. رفت (*sic*) که من بهار بخواهم.
[5] N. added هم.
[6] N. instead of this شیخ را.
[7] N. omitted.
[8] N. added شیخ.
[9] N. added وی.
[10] N. هیچکس را.
[11] N. added وی.
[12] N. میکردی.
[13] N. میگفتی.
[14] N. بتمام باز توانستندی گفت.
[15] N. omitted.

آن جوان و سك که دید که گفتند کار بنما یندہ[1] است نه به
بیننده و بگفته[2] ازو، و دیگر[3] شیخ محمد قصاب آملی که[4]
شا کرد وی * بود مذکری کردی شیخ ابو العباس وی را
از مجلس داشتن باز داشته بود که عامرا سخن نکوئی (*sic*)
که سخن وی بلند شده بود.[5]

Note.—Another copy of Anṣārī's *Ṭabaqāt*, dated 839 A.H., is preserved in the Nūrī 'Uthmāniyya library at Constantinople, No. 2500. See L. Massignon, *La passion d'al-Hallaj*, 1922, vol. ii, Bibliographie, No. 1059. In this work a short extract from the *Ṭabaqāt* is edited and translated, vol. i, pp. 367–69 and pl. xiii. Another in *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, by the same author, 1922, texts, pp. 99–100. Concerning the exact relation between Anṣārī's work and Jami's *Nafaḥāt* see W. Ivanow, "The sources of Jami's Nafahat": *JASB*, 1922, pp. 389–91.

May, 1923.

P.S.—I take this opportunity to mention that I am greatly indebted to Colonel G. Ranking and Mr. J. Van-Manen for their invaluable help with my English as well as friendly advice.—W. I.

[1] N. نما یندہ.

[2] N. وی کفته.

[3] N. دیکری.

[4] N. omitted.

[5] N. omitted from the asterisk.

July, 1921.